·	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	, ,				1			1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
1009 Idleberry (Lucas Valley/Marinwood)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		х	x	х								Х				
Valloy/Marinwood)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		Х	x	×								x				
223 Shoreline HIghway (Tam Junction)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the uniquee characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the innertory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	X	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
223 Shoreline HIghway (Tam Junction)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	X	x	X		x		x	x	x	x	x	×	×		
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		x	×					x							×	
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Where is this? Where the stable is now located?	Email																

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																—,	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
254 Lucas Valley Road Near Terra Linda Ridge	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'I housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematics isles for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters).530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I would	Email	x		x	×		х	x			Х		х			х	×
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. It: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda (2306. C This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				×				x				
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				×				X				
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 Lucas Valley Rd/lear terra Linda Ridge; 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. (2,1 The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area in units in this area (2,4 Tte Junits) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere i	Email			x	х				x		X			X			
2800 West Novato Blvd., Novato	If you need MORE " VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME" and " MODERATE INCOME " sites closer to Novato, our property at 2800 West Novato Blvd has plenty of room and space. Thank you. We appreciate all your hard work here	Email																Χ

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL			1		1	1			1	1	1	,	-	-	-		<del></del> ,
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
4260 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Woodacre	Hello Supervisor Rodoni, This message is regarding the Housing Element site proposals. Like yourself, I was born and raised in West Marin County. My family has been ranching in Marin for 5 generations, and our love for the land and community runs deep. We understand that there is a need for more affordable housing in Marin, however; We oppose any development at 4260 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (TUHS). Development on said property would be a detriment to the Valley consider how the lack of public transportation, water access, septic/sewage and the increase of traffic would impact the surrounding area - community, environment and wildlife as a whole. There are many other places in Marin where housing can be developed and integrated into the surrounding area to the benefit of the community. We are asking you to conserve the land at 4260 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. Thank you for your time.	Email				х		x				X		х	x			
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentives housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential home building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3 - 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer. High Wildfire Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aeathetto of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		x		x				x		×	x	×	x		x	
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		x	x					x							х	
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley: 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 ???	Email																
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		×	×	х				x				x				
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	x				x				х				

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge; 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concems regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures. Which do not currently exist anywhere in this				х	x				x		x			x			
6 Jeanette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		x	х	х								х				
6900 Sir Francis Drive Boulevard (San Geronino)	I could not access the Balancing Site work area so I am submitting these comments here. SGV is am amazing place to be due to low development. I have had the benefit of living here 25 years. What is being proposed in both of the areas of the School property and at the Gold Course are for higher end homes. Higher end homes are not a help for our community. We need homes for families with kids, We need Senior housing. We don't need another 127 above moderate income homes. Have some vision. Create a place with a grocery store, deli, and place for people to meet. Create Senior housing. Have ability to share vehicles. This area could become a hub for our community to use and support. It is also a sensitive environmental area. It used to be where water would spread out when it rained and slowly sink into the ground providing water all year round for the fish. More concrete and asphalt = more runoff. This vision of 98 separate high end homes here is not fitting to the rural area of our valley. It is just going to bring in more people who want a rural lifestyle from other areas and NOT give our locals homes. Every day, people, and families are looking for homes. Renters are being pushed out. It is unaffordable to live here. Solve the problem we have now, housing for our locals. Not bring more people here. Also, the place being considered at 6900 Sir Francis Drake is a privately owned place. Owned by a family that owns quite a bit of property in the Valley as it is. I certainly hope public monies are not going to rehab this property.									x		X					X	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transpation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential house building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Leanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4. 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer. High Wildfirer Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		X		x				x		x	x	x	x		x	
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		х	х	х								Х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development is the sare within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		x	x					x							×	
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58: Would this replace office park? If so 58 apartments or condos seems reasonable. No market rate	Email															Х	х
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site, 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall)	Email	×		х	x		x	x			x		x			x	x
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	_				1	1	1						-	-		
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	x				х				х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	х	х				x				х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvi/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact evacuation routes out of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvii/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact evacuation routes out of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				Х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAC (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Adhear terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of \$t. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would leasily be developed there, or the size of the property, which is near the end of a small half-mile				x	х				x		×			x			
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	With respect to the Lucas Valley sites being considered as potential housing sites, I submit the following comments: Sites located at 7 Mt. Lassen Drive and at Lucas Valley Road/Mt Muir near Terra Linda Ridge fail to comply with stated criteria for site selection. These sites present environmental hazards, including high fire danger as exhibited last August when a wildire approached housing and traffic became a hazard. These areas also fail to provide access to transportation, jobs, services, and amentities. Lucas Valley is an inappropriate choice. In addition, all of the Lucas Valley sites are in the wildland urban interface (WUI) zones that contradict Governor Newson's priorities to shift housing away from rural wildfire-prone areas and closer to urban centers.	Email	х			x		х		х		х		х				
70 Oxford Drive, Santa Venetia	RE: APN 180-261-10 Address: 70 Oxford Drive. The undersigned is owner of this large (27.8 acres, or approx. 1,211,000 sf) parcel. As currently zoned A2B2 (minimum lot size of 10,000 sf), it is extraordinarily and technically suitable for numerous residences. To help the County and the State to meet their Housing target, we agree with and welcome the proposed suggestion of multiple possible residences on this acreage, but suggest the number be reduced to a maximum of five (5). This necessarily lower number would result in (A) lot sizes more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, as specifically recommended in the Santa Venetia Community Plan; (B) smaller homes consistent with the affordability targets; (C) lot configurations more accessible (requiring less ground disturbance) and least likely to conflict with numerous environmental and cultural constraints extant on the site; and (D) a density nearly ten times less than the initial proposal, thus significantly less negative impact on the current traffic congestion on NSPR which is the sole access/egress to Santa Venetia.	Email	х			x				х		x						

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would ensure and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways.: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please foll	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 123-151)	×			х					x	x		x			x	
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EliR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways: .II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Sesime Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		x	х	x	х		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1						,										
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					х			х				ı
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. (Given the County's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development and worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Bilithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwellings use a county mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative Investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of housing of up to 4	Email																
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	х	х	х	х		х		х	х	х	х	х	х	х		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1	1	1	1	1 1		1	1		1	,					
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingo Rd. he site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than pr	Email				x		×			×							
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				Х					Х			Х				
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodriguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)-that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				x					х	х						
Bon Air Shopping Center (Greenbrae)	you should add this is your list of housing element sites. This land could accommodate many units, it is very close to public transportation and have plenty of available parking.	Email																х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	(Comment edited for length) The homeowners and residents of Los Ranchitos (LR) strongly believe that re-zoning LR for denser housing in inappropriate and short-sighted and strongly oppose this change. As you prepare the Housing Element for 2023-30, please take the following into consideration: 1. Incorrect categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." As a neighborhood, and in terms of its past and current deeds, land use and zoning designations, LR is fully built out. LR was founded and developed on the basis of one (1) single family dwelling per parcel, with the minimum parcel size of 1 acre. For this reason alone, rezoning is undesirable to the property owners. There are few if any unbuilt lots, and the few that may exist are highly sloped properties up steep, one-lane streets, likely private roads maintained by the property owners themselves, not by the County. These are wholly inappropriate for multi-family development. 2. Arbitrary categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." Not all the properties in LR are highlighted in the map. The assignment of properties as "underutilized residential" on the basis of property improvements is inconsistent and incorrect. Many properties that have been extensively remodeled are incorrectly designated as "underutilized." Many properties that have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties hat have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties hat have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties hat have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties have not seen maintained and are being lived in and enjoyed mainly by owners in residence. The high land to improvements ratio most likely results less from remodeling than from continuous, long-term property ownership under Proposition 13. Since many properties have not changed hands in recent years or even	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 64-74)	x	x		x				x		x		х	X			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL				T	1	I	l		I					]	1		
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	(Comment edited for length) The homeowners and residents of Los Ranchitos (LR) strongly believe that re-zoning LR for denser housing in inappropriate and short-sighted and strongly oppose this change. As you prepare the Housing Element for 2023-30, please take the following into consideration: 1. Incorrect categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." As a neighborhood, and in terms of its past and current deeds, land use and zoning designations, LR is fully built out. LR was founded and developed on the basis of one (1) single family dwelling per parcel, with the minimum parcel size of 1 acre. For this reason alone, rezoning is undesirable to the property owners. There are few if any unbuilt lots, and the few that may exist are highly sloped properties up steep, one-lane streets, likely private roads maintained by the property owners themselves, not by the County. These are wholly inappropriate for multi-family development. 2. Arbitrary categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." Not all the properties in LR are highlighted in the map. The assignment of properties as "underutilized residential" on the basis of property improvements is inconsistent and incorrect. Many properties that have been extensively remodeled are incorrectly designated as "underutilized." Many properties that have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized," when under the County's own definition, they should be. These designations are arbitrary and inconsistent, and inconsistent with reality. 3. Incorrect Improvement-to-land ratios on property ax records. We disagree with the County's assessment of LR properties as "underutilized residential" according to the definition presented. Properties in LR have been maintained and are being lived in and enjoyed mainly by owners in residence. The high land to improvements ratio most likely results less from remodeling than from continuous, long-term property ownership under Proposition 13. Since many properties have not changed hands in recent years or even d	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 64-74)	x	х		х				x		x		x	x			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	l am writing in response to the 2023-2030 Housing Element Proposals for the Los Ranchitos area of Marin County. The current proposal for approximately 139 additional units in Los Ranchitos does not consider the safety of residents and the impact on the natural environment. 1. Los Ranchitos is made up of lots on narrow hillside streets, without sidewalks and street lights. Adding more units will increase the difficulty of fighting fires on the upper streets or safely evacuating residents when earthquakes occur. 2. The only way in and out of Los Ranchitos is on Los Ranchitos Road. Traffic on Los Ranchitos Road becomes gridlock today when there is the slightest slowdown on Highway 101. I expect traffic will increase as the proposed housing units in the Northgate Mall are built. Adding more units in Los Ranchitos will make that even worse. 3. Where will the water come from for all of these proposed additional housing units, including the ones outside of Los Ranchitos? We are all reducing water usage to meet current water restrictions. I would think new sources of water should be identified and funded before large scale housing increases are proposed. 4. Los Ranchitos lots were created and deeded to be 1 acre minimum parcels. We are zoned light agricultural, resulting in many barnyard animals and backyard vegetable gardens. The rural nature of this area is what attracted me to this area and I am sure that is true for most of my neighbors. As I noted above, many of our streets are on steep hills. So to get 139 additional units in Los Ranchitos zoning will be changed to allow apartment-like buildings on the flatter streets. This will destroy the rural/wildlife feel to this neighborhood.	: Email		х		х			х	х		Х		х	х			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	I find it hard to believe that this many new housing units is even being considered! For the last three years we've been told that we can use only 60 gallons of water a day. And you want to add 1000 more houses in Los Ranchitos? Where does the water come from? Traffic is already insane, and this will add nothing but more gridlock. What about the fire hazards in densely populated areas? I find it absolutely insane that this could even be in anybody's minds. The people that live in this area chose it because of the zoning and the lot sizes. How can you just swoop in and say the "hell with you we're going to do what we want"? What happened to private property rights?	Email				х				х				х	x			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	I write to express my great objections to the proposed housing element to rezone Los Ranchitos in unincorporated Marin County. It is not well thought out and will have many negative consequences. First, the infrastructure of water, fire protection, education do not support this proposal. Due to the hilly properties and limited egress/ingress greater density will create a major fire liability and risk. Already, only one insurer will write policies for this neighborhood. Second, Los Ranchitos lots were created and deeded to be 1 acre minimum parcels for single family housing. Increasing density here will destroy the rural nature of our neighborhood. Third, Los Ranchitos is a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). In addition to increased fire heazerd, it will greatly affect the native animal habitats of turkeys, owls, deer, foxes and other animals. Fourth, The only way into and out of Los Ranchitos Road. That road is already gridlocked during morning rush hours. The addition of more new housing units in Northgate and Terra Linda will greatly exacerbate traffic and gridlock under normal circumstances, and create a huge potential for loss of life in the event of major emergencies like fires and earthquakes. Adding housing to Los Ranchitos will only make a bad situation worse. Fifth, Los Ranchitos is currently zoned agricultural with numerous barnyard animals kept here. Increased density will adversely affect them as well. This housing element is not well thought out and will be detrimental to health and safety as outlined above. I urge that this plan not be adopted.	Email				х				х		х		х				

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	80,	DC!	INT	SER	TDF	חסיי	ртр	ACT	NINAD	CE A	NAT	CI	EIP	\A/A+	шт	EQ	GD!
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	lwrite to express my objections to proposals in the County's Housing Element to rezone the Los Ranchitos area of unincorporated Marin County. While I acknowledge the need for additional housing, and generally support efforts to equitably provide for the good of the greater community, I believe that the proposal to rezone this particular area of the County is misguided. For one thing, the only way into and out of Los Ranchitos is Los Ranchitos Road. As things currently stand, Los Ranchitos is already a very congested road, used as the primary corridor through which people access the Northgate malls, Terra Linda High, Mark Day School and other points west of Highway 101 and in the valley between Central San Rafael and Lucas Valley. Los Ranchitos Road is already becoming a dangerous thoroughfare, particularly at the two Los Ranchitos Road/Circle Road intersections. The planned redevelopment of the Northgate Mall (up to 1,443 residential units, I understand?) is going to put even more pressure pressure on Los Ranchitos Road. The addition of another 80-139 more units in the Los Ranchitos neighbor is going to push things over the edge. Heavy traffic and gridlock will be normal circumstances - a nuisance on a daily basis, but a real safety hazard in the event of a significant emergency or disaster, such as an earthquake or fire. Further, as a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) area, the Los Ranchitos area already poses a significant risk (so much so that at least one insurer that I'm aware or already refuses to provide coverage to residents of the area). With greater density between them and the only road out, all residents of Los Ranchitos, but particularly this in the hilly portions of the neighborhood (the majority of the current residents) will face a real and life threatening challenge should a wildfire or other disaster strike. Greater density in this WUI will also have an adverse, if not existential, impact on turkey, owl, deer, fox and other animal populations that call the area home. The plan to rezone Los Ranchi	Email		x	x	х			х			х		х	x			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Like many Los Ranchitos residents my wife and I both feel very strongly that we do not think additional development in our agricultural neighborhood is wise. Denser housing will destroy the area, cause additional traffic, eliminate much of the animal friendly atmosphere and potentially be significantly difficult for fire engines and other ingress and egress. Please reconsider and hopefully leave our area the beautiful place that we love.	Email				х				х		х		х				
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Los Ranchitos Housing Element Sites: I would like to comment about the upcoming Housing Element environmental review. I do not believe that there is infrastructure regarding Safety Elements and Water supply. Our driveways is 8 feet wide up a steep knoll. It is not conducive to adding density housing. The past two years drought, is an indication that we do not have enough rain to sustain our community. If we are to add more housing it will increase water usage. What will happen to the community if the water is not available. Regarding the infrastructure, the roads will need to be addressed. The safety will be more dangerous for emergency vehicles if the roads are full of traffic on two lane roads. Thank you for considering my comments to the environmental review	Email		X		х								х	х			
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential home building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3 - 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, incling amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors include: High Wildfirer Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect brighy influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		×		x				×		x	x	x	x		x	
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		Х	х	х								x				

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NATO	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email	PUL	X	X	IKF	PKK	PIK	ACI	X	SEA	INAI	COL	FIK	vvA1	nL1	X	GDL
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley.2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) - 254 100 or less Good location but too many units, must be affordable. Rotary Senior Housing is excellent. Perhaps expand affordable housing for seniors there with larger 2 BR units	Email															х	х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. I'm not opposed to additional housing, but it should be done gradually and incrementally. I'm concerned about the number of units planned for Jeanette Prandi/Juvi of 254 units. That, I, believe, is WAY more than Rotary Village. It is one thing if it is planned as beautifully as Rotary Village with one-story facilities and have trees and landscaping. It is another thing if you build a 4 story building in the center of the meadow of Marin County Parks.	Email								х		х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive; part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters).530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I wouldn	Email			x	х		x	x			×		x			x	×
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	my wife and I are long time residents of Lucas Valley and most every day we visit and walk in the delightful redwood lined area in front of Juvi. It is with shock and utter disappointment that I see that this site is being considered for additional apartment housing. In case u have not noticed the traffic on Lucas Valley road is already quite bad especially when inevitably get stopped at the new light on Los Gamos. If this new housing is approved the addI vehicles on the road will be intolerable Each new resident will need a car as there is NO reliable public transportation. Would make more sense to be built much closer to hwy 101 Please do NOT approve this thoughtless proposal	Email				х		х				х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	my wife and I are long time residents of Lucas Valley and most every day we visit and walk in the delightful redwood lined area in front of Juvi. It is with shock and utter disappointment that I see that this site is being considered for additional apartment housing. In case u have not noticed the traffic on Lucas Valley road is already quite bad especially when inevitably get stopped at the new light on Los Gamos. If this new housing is approved the addI vehicles on the road will be intolerable Each new resident will need a car as there is NO reliable public transportation. Would make more sense to be built much closer to hwy 101 Please do NOT approve this thoughtless proposal	Email				х		x										
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house); 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/Inear terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email ;		х	x	x				x				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandil/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	х				х				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Juvi/Jeanette Prandi currently has low income senior housing. An expansion of this senior housing would be good use of this area and needed in the community. Multistory housing/254 units on this small property does not fit in with this area of single family homes and the surrounding openspace and can not be supported by current transportation structure and schools.	Email		х	х	х				х							х	

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Juvi/Jeanette Prandi currently has low income senior housing. An expansion of this senior housing would be good use of this area and needed in the community. Multistory housing/254 units on this small property does not fit in with this area of single family homes and the surrounding openspace and can not be supported by current transportation structure and schools.	Email		х	×	x				х							х	
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvi/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact outcome of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvi/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact evacuation routes out of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge; 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in thi				×	×				x		X			x			
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	With respect to the Lucas Valley sites being considered as potential housing sites, I submit the following comments: Juvenile Hall Site Master Plan (A copy of the Master Plan and Appendix will be presented to the Board of Supervisors at the March 2, 2021 meeting.): A Master Plan was developed through collaboration of Marin County Supervisor Bob Rouniguiere, Planning Director Mark Reisenfeld, and Lucas Valley Community members. The Master Plan was submitted to the Board of Supervisors and adopted in 1994. The Plan encompasses the Jeanette Prandi and Juvenile Hall sites being considered as housing sites. The Master Plan provides: a. Upper Idylberry Corridor - The plan stipulates the area north of the Idylberry is transferred to the Open Space District, and there shall be no structures or other improvements north of the Idylberry Corridor. b. Lower SE portion of the Juvenile Hall Site - the lower grass area is preserved for recreational uses. c. SW corner of the site (Jeanette Prandi Way) - shall remain as County Administrative and Storage Facilities only. d. Rotary Senior Housing (Jeanette Prandi Way) - shall be limited to 55 units, single story only. e. Juvenile Hall and County Parks Offices - area shall remain as County facilities. No additional development is permitted. The restrictions of the Master Plan prohibit consideration of this entire area for possible housing sites. In addition, all of the Lucas Valley sites are in the wildland urban interface (WUI) zones that contradict Governor Newson's priorities to shift housing away from rural wildfire-prone areas and closer to urban centers.	Email								х		х		Х				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL								1	1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley (alley) Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential housing amenities in our area. I. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4.530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer: High Wildfire Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influent	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 173-178)											x					x
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		х	x					х							x	
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. Marinwood Market - 136 100 or less: Best and necessary site for redevelopment, but it should be a mixed use development as was proposed by Bridge Housing some years ago. Housing number should be reduced to under 100	Email								х								
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I hope that the Marinwood Plaza/market site is again under consideration for housing. As you most likely know, some 15 years or so ago, the community shot down an excellent proposal from Bridge Housing. Except for the market, the property remains a derellet eyesore. Many of us in Marinwood would like to see the property improved, including a modest amount of housing development, along with community amenities such as a coffee shop, brew pub, or other gathering place, and other shops such as hair salon, co-working space, etc. It is close to public transportation, schools, and major employers most notably Kaiser. It's a far superior site for development than the St Vincents property which has myriad sea level rise and other environmental challenges, and very little other infrastructure. I hope the property will be on be on tomorrow's meeting agenda.	Email																х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. Then two of the sites are still contaminated from the former cleaners at Marinwood Market Plaza - St. Vincent's and Marinwood Market Plaza. So what happens with the housing planned in these locations?1936 units?	Email														Х		]
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general! support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, shertiff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters).530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to sate this site under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I wouldn't be	Email			x	x		x	х			×		x			x	x

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL														-			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	The 2022 Marin County Candidates site for Unincorporated Marin and especially Marinwood/ Lucas Valley/Silveria Ranch is absurd. It targets just 5 square miles with 80% of the housing allocation for affordable housing in one community WITHOUT essential planning for schools, roads, government services, water, sewer and other essential services. Why "plan to fail"? Shouldn't a good faith effort to build affordable housing in our community also include a comprehensive plan for accommodating growth? It doesn't. This is why it should be rejected today. Instead, let's address the core questions for growth AND the financial impact of adding massive amount of largely non profit housing to a single community WITHOUT ADDITIONAL TAX BASE. Marinwood/Lucas Valley currently has approximately 2700 housing units for 6000 residents. The proposed housing sites could add 2300 apartments and 5500 residents who ALL WILL NEED schools, water, government services, transportation, access to shopping, etc. Shouldn't a proper plan for growth precede approval for housing? One of the sites listed is Marinwood Plaza, our communities ONLY commercial plaza within walking distance for thousands of residents. If the plan for 160 units is approved, this would squeeze out a vital community center to the detriment of all. This is not including the problem of TOXIC WASTE contamination clean up suitable for residential dwelling is a long way off despite community pressure on the Regional Water Quality Control Board who will not enforce its own clean up orders on the current owners. Despite the harsh criticism of the RHNA process, I believe there is a real community desire for more affordable housing in a community that will be planned appropriately, won't redevelop our neighborhoods and utilize open spaces like Silveira Ranch, St Vincents and other sites. While everyone I know supports the idea of more housing, not a single one wants a poorly conceived plan that forces large housing projects without considering the impacts. Reject the current RHNA pl	Email		x	×					х		x				x		
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house); 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	×	x				х				x				
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marins IS Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	x	x				х				x				
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Marinwood market area has been talked about for years as a good site for housing units because of access to 101, market, etc. and is a good location for expansion of housing-it is also close to public transportation.	Email																х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Marinwood market area has been talked about for years as a good site for housing units because of access to 101, market, etc. and is a good location for expansion of housing-it is also close to public transportation.	Email																х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School -1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist anywhere in this area. (3) The site at 530 Blackstone Drive (current) site of religious house) could easily fit a multi-unit development, however 32 units on this site is fat too large for the	Email			×	x				x		x			x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1 -		1	1	1			, ,		, ,		- 1	-		<del></del>	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	While I am generally in favor of additional low-income housing in Marin, it appears that the proposals for development of Marinwood Avenue turn that are of our neighborhoods (I live across the street) into an area that exclusively low-income housing. Experiments with consolidating low-income housing in the 1960-80's proved to us that this does not work well. These areas become neglected bygovernment and residents alike. Is it possible to make these development more diverse?	Email															х	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Future Housing Sites in Marin County. I attended the local Housing meeting regarding Santa Venetia and Los Ranchitos on February 15th and live in the Santa Venetia area. Here are my comments from a Santa Venetia resident perspective: 1. The process, while advised by the Marin County Planning Department, is being run by a consulting agency that is not familiar with Marin County and the local areas & neighborhoods. 2. The number of assigned housing units to Santa Venetia, 422, ignores the following. Before housing site numbers are assigned and accepted, a "CEQA-lite" analysis should be performed to determine if the numbers and locations are practical from a CEQA perspective. We heard these concerns brushed off with the response that if any development is going to be done, a full CEQA would be completed before development could/would proceed. This would be an "after-the-fact" process, with the fact that the housing numbers and sites have already been assigned and accepted, and would be too late to be influential in the development process. a. There is only one practical vehicle road out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by three schools, the one at the JCC, the Marin School, and Venetia Valley school, and a large pre-school. Traffic in & out of Santa Venetia is also already heavily impacted by the JCC, the Civic Center traffic, the Marin Lagoon traffic, the Veterans Memorial traffic, the Marin Lagoon Housing and the commercial enterprises along McInnis Parkway. b. Some of the sites selected are in wetlands areas, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road. c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site. d. The total number of housing units assigned to Marin County, and not just to the unincorporated areas, does not take into account the water needs. And we, Marin County as serviced by MMWD, are in the middle of a water shor					x				×				×	x			
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Here in Santa Venetia, we are living with water shortages, traffic congestion, and our community's evacuation route was named the most dangerous in Marin and yet huge additional numbers of housing are proposed for this flood prone neighborhood. That's insanel We are not fooled by claims that these new residents won't drive everywhere. They will. We already know that every person of driving age in our neighborhood not only drives but owns a car, or truck. They line our streets, further restricting access routes. There are sites where housing can happen like at Northgate Mall, but not in our overcrowded flood zone.	Email				х				х	x			х				
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Hi, I would like to object to 251 N San Pedro as a site to build housing. There is a Child Center there serving many families. The ball field on the property is used by the children at the school and people in the neighborhood. There are very few ball fields for Little League. This ball field should not be taken away from ball players. I live in the condo complex next door. Parking is already limited for residents and guests. We can't absorb all the people people who would live there who have more cars then the give spots for them and their guests. If housing needs to be built in Santa Venetia why not 1565 Vendola Dr? The school property there has not been used for decades.	Email																х
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I am a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia, yet the Housing Element recommends 422 additional units, representing an increase of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural swell as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at severe risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received	Email				×				x	x			x	x		x	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I am a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia, yet the Housing Element recommends 422 additional units, representing an increase of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEOA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural as well as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEOA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at severe risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently receive	Email		x		×				×	×	×	×	x	x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1												, ,				
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I am against the proposed units on North San Pedro Road. This proposed project is completely unsustainable and not researched for undesirable living situations. There are many factors that indicate this would not be a good site to build. Factors such as flood control, sea rising at a rate we can expect in the coming years, congestion, removal of a ball park and mostly there are no services to support this project. Well thought out projects include parks, services, bike paths, sidewalks and a reasonable egress in case of fire. North San Pedro Road is all ready congested due to a large school and many churches on this road. Another road to San Rafael is available to Point San Pedro Road however this road is failing due to floods in the winter and very evident sink holes that are not being addressed. More traffic would of course erode the roads further and in the past have had slides on this road particularly after recent tree removal has increased the likely occurance.	Email		х	х	х				х	х	х		х				
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I attended the zoom meeting a few nights ago. I share the concern of some of my neighbors, well articulated by Gina Hagen. While I totally support affordable housing (so question if this will be "affordable" for working class people), I think we already have too many high density buildings on San Pedro Road, Jcc, school, rest homes, elder affordable housing, civic center etc So I would support maybe 25 more units or something manageable, but hundreds seems like asking for trouble in an emergency. I live on Labrea way and I am glad we have housing for families, down the street, but a common problem is the amount of cars and high occupancy of some of the apartments. The overflow of cars goes all the way to Rosal, and currently I have had cars parked in front of my house for a month and more. It is not a significant problem in my case, but my neighbor who has teenagers with cars, is having to struggle to park their own cars, while the overflow is from housing two blocks away. Obviously San Rafael is a good place for more housing and i would think a place closer to the freeway like Marin Square could be used for extra units of housing. I also would personally like to build an accessory unit in my front yard for a student, teacher, medical professional, at affordable rate. It would be nice to have a department in Marin county who could help seniors like myself design,, get permits, and loans to afford to create such units. I myself was a renter in Marin for 36 years and lived in in-law apartments. I found it much more private and a win/win solution for the owner, typically older retired person, and myself as young professional. I was excited about an organization called Lily Pads and attended a meeting but found out later the owner was no longer providing services. So this would be a great thing to promote. Thank you for including us in your work. Hope we can have more affordable housing, while preserving the safety of our neighborhoods.	Email					×			х							x	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I served on the Santa Venetia Community Plan (SVCP) Committee for almost 10 years, including working with County Staff the last 4 years, until its final adoption in 2017. This process included a thorough survey of our neighbors who commented on every empty parcel and open space for future development (and in fact Godbe told us the response was overwhelming with a higher than normal percentage of participation). Our SVCP Committee Members represented every corner of Santa Venetia. We held community meetings (that were well-attended) so I residents had a chance to voice their opinions and ideas. No one knows Santa Venetia better than Santa Venetians. The plan was supposed to cover everything of interest to ensure a diverse, family-oriented, and happy community for years to come. Adding 442 units is simply untenable for a small, working-class hamlet such as Santa Venetia. The last two open spaces (two ball fields) are slated for high density housing. This is totally uncharacteristic of the surrounding neighbors who live in small, single-family housing. In the February 15th Housing Element Zoom call, with County Staff and Contractors from who knows where?, we were informed that our Community Plan would need to be updated. Who would do this work? When and how soon would these updates happen? How can the County randomly update our Community Plans that we spent so many resources on. SB-9 and SB-10 are a complete contradiction to our Community Plan that we dedicated years of work and volunteer hours to finally see its adoption. These past summers, we've stayed inside due to smoke and/or triple-digit weather. We used a bucket from our shower to water our indoor and deck plants while our yard withered and died due to restrictions and requirements in place from Marin Water. We worked out evacuation routes to alert residents to escape danger due to our one road in and out of Santa Venetia. I heard chain saws, chippers, and weed whackers almost every day, regardless of the high, fire-danger days. This is due to San Rafae	Email									×			×	x			
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I will reiterate the comments I made at the February 15 Housing Element meeting I've lived in SV for over 30 years. I've served on the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association Board of Directors for almost 30 years. Through our neighborhood association, The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA), we try to get the word out so that our residents are aware of upcoming projects and opportunity to comment. We've heard from Santa Venetia residents that they want to protect our quality of life. We are already concerned about the constant fire danger, flooding, Sea Level Rise, ingress and egress, and unsafe evacuation routes. Climate change is a huge concern for us and as well, we have run out of water in Marin County and are under strict mandates, so I can't understand how adding more and more housing units will help. And to restate, 422 units in SV is an increase of almost 25% of the 1,700-1,800 units we currently had, at last count. It's a very shocking number of additional units for us. I grew up in San Rafael. I hate what they've done to the City and have been constantly disappointed with the building choices and what they have given up. I don't want to see that happening in Santa Venetia — more congestion and loss of our green spaces. Affordable housing sounds great on paper, but we never seem to get that promise fulfilled. I've followed projects in San Rafael and for almost every project, the promise is a huge amount of housing with a small portion designated affordable and then after the project passes through the hurdles, the affordable-housing number is adjusted always downward. I remember previously rules were passed to keep up with the demand of affordable housing, but the goalposts seem to constantly change and that number is lowered. What is the promise that won't happen with this process? Also, I heard them say at that meeting, they were giving schools and churches more flexibility by allowing them to build on parking lots? If that is the case, where will people park? They've already lowered	Email								×	×	х		×	×		x	

-	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL								_									
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	(Comment edited for length) As the directors of Marin Cove Homeowner's Association, and on behalf of the Association, we register our strong objections to plans to turn the Old Gallinas school site into a housing complex. The Marin Cove subdivision is in the Santa Venetia neighborhood. It has 75 units, on single lane streets, and has limited parking areas. The owners are generally single families; some of which have children. The owners, in part due to the limited public transportation, generally use cars to get to and from work. Marin Cove HOA, not the school district, owns the strip of land on the west side of Schmidt Lane separating the field at the Old Gallinas School District from Schmidt Lane. The HOA does not consent to the use of its property to provide access for proposed housing. To the extent the driveway on Schmidt Lane, which crosses the strip of property owned by the Marin Cove HOA, is claimed to be an easement to permit access to the field, if the proposed housing development contemplates the use of such driveway, such is a dramatically increased use of the easement. We do not consent to the use of the driveway to serve a 180-unit development. For the reasons discussed below, we request the removal of the Old Gallinas property from the list of sites proposed for affordable housing. We make these objections based on Government Code section 65589.21 of the Housing Crisis Act ("HCA"), which provides for denial of a proposed housing development project if such project would have a "specific, adverse environmental and social impact," as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 65589.5. A significant adverse environmental and social impact mass a "significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact" (emphasis added), based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions. (Govt. Code, § 65580.5d()(2).) Preliminarily, we object to the lack of notice of consideration of the Old Gallinas school site as a location	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 75-79)			×	x	x							x				
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	[Comment edited for length) The Northbridge Homeowners Association ("NHA") respectfully submits these initial comments regarding 251 North San Pedro Rd. (herein, "Old Gallinas School and Ball Field")—and also regarding the identified potential sites in Santa Venetia more generally. We very much appreciate the County's consideration of the below comments. Northbridge is a residential neighborhood in Santa Venetia more generally. We very much appreciate the County's consideration of the below comments. Northbridge is a residential neighborhood on and privately-cowned tennis courts. Given our close proximity to Old Gallinas School and Ball Field, any proposed development of that property is obviously of critical interest (and concern) to our residents. The County's draft candidate site list identifies Old Gallinas School and Ball Field as a candidate site for adding an extremely large number of what would have to be high-density housing units in a relatively small space. The NHA has received feedback from some of the residents in our neighborhood. The scope, size, and would-be density of this, alone, are shocking and of great concern to our neighborhood. Old Gallinas School and Ball Field would be a very poor choice/candidate for any significant housing development for multiple reasons: Please Don't Get Rid of Santa Venetia's Only Ball Field. To accommodate a project anywhere near the scope suggested in the draft list would require not only getting did of the school buildings (which themselves are currently being used for essential child day care services), but also would require getting rid of (i.e., building on top of) the baseball field which currently comprises the majority of the property. This is the only ball field that Santa Venetia formation of existing recreational assets in the community such as theexisting ball and play fields." This item was included in the Community Plan because numerous residents identified this specifically (including the Old Gallinas Ball Field, in particular) as a critical ne	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 87-89)			×	x				х		х	x	X				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	_												, ,			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Future Housing Sites in Marin County. I attended the local Housing meeting regarding Santa Venetia and Los Ranchitos on February 15th and live in the Santa Venetia area. Here are my comments from a Santa Venetia resident perspective: 1. The process, while advised by the Marin County Planning Department, is being run by a consulting agency that is not familiar with Marin County and the local areas & neighborhoods. 2. The number of assigned housing units to Santa Venetia, 422, ignores the following. Before housing site numbers are assigned and accepted, a "CEQA-lite" analysis should be performed to determine if the numbers and locations are practical from a CEQA perspective. We heard these concerns brushed off with the response that if any development is going to be done, a full CEQA would be completed before development could/would proceed. This would be an "after-the-fact" process, with the fact that the housing numbers and sites have already been assigned and accepted, and would be too late to be influential in the development process. a. There is only one practical vehicle road out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by three schools, the one at the JCC, the Marin School, and Venetia Valley school, and a large pre-school. Traffic in & out of Santa Venetia is also already heavily impacted by the JCC, the Civic Center traffic, the Marin Lagoon traffic, the Veterans Memorial traffic, the Marin Lagoon Housing and the commercial enterprises along McInnis Parkway. b. Some of the sites selected are in wetlands areas, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road. c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site. d. The total number of housing units assigned to Marin County, and not just to the unincorporated area, does not take into account the water needs. And we, Marin County as serviced by MMWD, are in the middle of a water short	Email				x				x				x	X			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Here in Santa Venetia, we are living with water shortages, traffic congestion, and our community's evacuation route was named the most dangerous in Marin and yet huge additional numbers of housing are proposed for this flood prone neighborhood. That's insane! We are not fooled by claims that these new residents won't drive everywhere. They will. We already know that every person of driving age in our neighborhood not only drives but owns a car, or truck. They line our streets, further restricting access routes. There are sites where housing can happen like at Northgate Mall, but not in our overcrowded flood zone.	Email				x				x	x			x				
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Hi, I would like to object to 251 N San Pedro as a site to build housing. There is a Child Center there serving many families. The ball field on the property is used by the children at the school and people in the neighborhood. There are very few ball fields for Little League. This ball field should not be taken away from ball players. I live in the condo complex next door. Parking is already limited for residents and guests. We can't absorb all the people people who would live there who have more cars then the give spots for them and their guests. If housing needs to be built in Santa Venetia why not 1565 Vendola Dr? The school property there has not been used for decades.	Email			х		×											
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I am a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia, yet the Housing Element recommends 422 additional units, representing an increase of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-ollar homes puts our cultural as well as our natural environment at risk. For example, Cxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at severe risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received	Email		×		×				×	×	×	×	×	×			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I am against the proposed units on North San Pedro Road. This proposed project is completely unsustainable and not researched for undesirable living situations. There are many factors that indicate this would not be a good site to build. Factors such as flood control, sea rising at a rate we can expect in the coming years, congestion, removal of a ball park and mostly there are no services to support this project. Well thought out projects include parks, services, bike paths, sidewalks and a reasonable egress in case of fire. North San Pedro Road is all ready congested due to a large school and many churches on this road. Another road to San Rafael is available to Point San Pedro Road however this road is failing due to floods in the winter and very evident sink holes that are not being addressed. More traffic would of course erode the roads further and in the past have had slides on this road particularly after recent tree removal has increased the likely occurance.	Email		х	х	х				х	х	х		х				
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I attended the zoom meeting a few nights ago. I share the concern of some of my neighbors, well articulated by Gina Hagen. While I totally support affordable housing (so question if this will be "affordable" for working class people), I think we already have too many high density buildings on San Pedro Road, Jcc, school, rest homes, elder affordable housing, civic center etc So I would support maybe 25 more units or something manageable, but hundreds seems like asking for trouble in an emergency. I live on Labrea way and I am glad we have housing for families, down the street, but a common problem is the amount of cars and high occupancy of some of the apartments. The overflow of cars goes all the way to Rosal, and currently I have had cars parked in front of my house for a month and more. It is not a significant problem in my case, but my neighbor who has teenagers with cars, is having to struggle to park their own cars, while the overflow is from housing two blocks away. Obviously San Rafael is a good place for more housing and i would think a place closer to the freeway like Marin Square could be used for extra units of housing. I also would personally like to build an accessory unit in my front yard for a student, teacher, medical professional, at affordable rate. It would be nice to have a department in Marin county who could help seniors like myself design, get permits, and loans to afford to create such units. I myself was a renter in Marin for 36 years and lived in in-law apartments. I found it much more private and a win/win solution for the owner, typically older retired person, and myself as young professional. I was excited about an organization called Lily Pads and attended a meeting but found out later the owner was no longer providing services. So this would be a great thing to promote. Thank you for including us in your work. Hope we can have more affordable housing, while preserving the safety of our neighborhoods.	Email					x			×							X	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		,			,												
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I served on the Santa Venetia Community Plan (SVCP) Committee for almost 10 years, including working with County Staff the last 4 years, until its final adoption in 2017. This process included a thorough survey of our neighbors who commented on every empty parcel and open space for future development (and in fact Godbe told us the response was overwhelming with a higher than normal percentage of participation). Our SVCP Committee Members represented every corner of Santa Venetia. We held community meetings (that were well-attended) so all residents had a chance to voice their opinions and ideas. No one knows Santa Venetia better than Santa Venetians. The plan was supposed to cover everything of interest to ensure a diverse, family-oriented, and happy community for years to come. Adding 442 units is simply untenable for a small, working-class hamlet such as Santa Venetia. The last two open spaces (two ball fields) are slated for high density housing. This is totally uncharacteristic of the surrounding neighbors who live in small, single-family housing. In the February 15th Housing Element Zoom call, with County Staff and Contractors from who knows where?, we were informed that our Community Plan would need to be updated. Who would do this work? When and how soon would these updates happen? How can the County randomly update our Community Plan that we spent so many resources on. SB-9 and SB-10 are a complete contradiction to our Community Plan that we dedicated years of work and volunteer hours to finally see its adoption. These past summers, we've stayed inside due to smoke and/or triple-digit weather. We used a bucket from our shower to water our indoor and deck plants while our yard withered and died due to restrictions and requirements in place from Marin Water. We worked out evacuation routes to alert residents to escape danger due to our one road in and out of Santa Venetia. I heard chain saws, chippers, and weed whackers almost every day, regardless of the high, fire-danger days. This is due to San Rafa	Email									×			×	×			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I will reiterate the comments I made at the February 15 Housing Element meeting I've lived in SV for over 30 years. I've served on the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association Board of Directors for almost 30 years. Through our neighborhood association, The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA), we try to get the word out so that our residents are aware of upcoming projects and opportunity to comment. We've heard from Santa Venetia residents that they want to protect our quality of life. We are already concerned about the constant fire danger, flooding, Sea Level Rise, ingress and egress, and unsafe evacuation routes. Climate change is a huge concern for us and as well, we have run out of water in Marin County and are under strict mandates, so I can't understand how adding more and more housing units will help. And to restate, 422 units in SV is an increase of almost 25% of the 1,700-1,800 units we currently had, at last count. It's a very shocking number of additional units for us. I grew up in San Rafael. I hate what they've done to the City and have been constantly disappointed with the building choices and what they have given up. I don't want to see that happening in Santa Venetia — more congestion and loss of our green spaces. Affordable nousing sounds great on paper, but we never seem to get that promise fulfilled. I've followed projects in San Rafael and for almost every project, the promise is a huge amount of housing with a small portion designated affordable and then after the project passes through the hurdles, the affordable-housing number is adjusted always downward. I remember previously rules were passed to keep up with the demand of affordable housing, but the goalposts seem to constantly change and that number is lowered. What is the promise that won't happen with this process? Also, I heard them say at that meeting, they were giving schools and churches more flexibility by allowing them to build on parking lots! If that is the case, where will people park? They've already lowered	Email								x	x	x		x	x		x	
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Re: Marin County Housing and Safety Elements Update, 2023 – 2031. The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA) is an organization representing the interests of 1,700 – 1,800 households (4,474 residents per the 2019 census figures) who live in Santa Venetia. As an organization, we are dedicated to the enhancement and preservation of the character and quality of life of the Santa Venetia neighborhood. We do our best to represent our community and have an established reputation to be a voice for proper development. And in accordance with our mission statement, we, the Board Members of the SVNA, feel compelled to comment on this issue. We want to ensure that the Marin County Board of Supervisors receives an accurate impression from our community regarding the updated Housing Element and are writing today to summarize feedback we have heard from many of our members. Many residents of Santa Venetia, including members of the SVNA, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting where consultants representing the interests of the housing element initiative presented online tools for community feedback. We find these tools inadequate; rather nevroying members of the SVNA, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting where consultants representing the interests of the housing element recommends 422 additional units for Santa Venetia. There are currently fewer than 1,800 residences in Santa Venetia, so this represents an increase of approximately 25%— far more growth than the neighborhood has seen for at least two decades. This mandate seems utterly siloed from the worsening reality of global warming and climate change, (the existence of which was recognized both in the Countywide Plan and by the Marin County Civil Grand Jury) which is leading to catastrophic weather events such as fires and flooding. The upland parts of Santa Venetia not directly threatened by flooding are part of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and are subject to year-round fire danger. Like all of Marin, we are constrained by drought, and our water supply comes	Email				x				x	x			x	х		х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1	1	1	1			1	т —	1	1	1		, ,			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Inverness, Balmoral Way	(Comment edited for length) I am a resident of Old Inverness, specifically Balmoral Way, Please consider the following comments as you finalize your recommendations: The entire approach of this planning effort is misguided. The consultant seems to have arbitrarily plopped new housing onto a map of West Marin without considering County planning history, constraints on the land, or natural resources, let alone community input. This top-down and ill-informed approach is unlikely to succeed, certainly not without damaging community good will, neighborhood cohesion, natural resources and other values of importance. The sites to be developed should be chosen only after a thorough inventory of geology, water supply, slope and other relevant factors. The 2007 Countywide Plan conceived of the entirety of West Marin as a rural, agricultural and low-density region, serving the Bay Area's recreational needs. This reflects the large proportion of the undeveloped lands that are protected as national, state and county parks. Further it carried forward the zoning decisions of the Board of Supervisors in the 1970's, which put a high priority on agricultural and natural resource reservation. If not implemented with great care, this plan risks contravening the supervisors' vision for West Marin. It should not be carried out until the County as a whole considers the larger planning goals for the area. An "elephant-in-the-room" with the housing shortage is the effect of AirBnB. If the County could reign in this business, the housing supply would quickly rebound, with numerous benefits to the community. Additionally, any new regulations for implementing the current planning process must avoid the ironic outcome that the newly constructed residential sites will also be converted to vacation rentals. Indeed, I suggest the County begin its effort to increase housing supply by tackling this behemoth before undertaking the kind of process it is currently enaged in. Assuming willing sellers of residential properties can be found in Balmor	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 16-19)	x	x		x		x		x		x		x	x	x	x	
Inverness, Balmoral Way	I am writing about the draft list of "underutilized residential housing" in Inverness, specifically those listed on Balmoral Way in Inverness. I am the property owner of 5 Balmoral Way. Imagine my surprise to see my own property (and my house which was fully rebuilt in 2015 with full permits from the county) included on this list as "underutilized residential housing." I was even more surprised to see all of my neighbors' homes on Balmoral Way (in which my neighbors live) to be similarly listed. Obviously the folks who came up with these addresses on Balmoral Way made a significant factual error that needs to be corrected by deleting the Balmoral Way addresses from the list. This isn't about NIMBY — this is simply a factual matter that the listed addresses are not underutilized housing sites. Balmoral Way is a small, one-lane, private, drit road with no empty lots. Each lot is already built on and fully-utilized. Each lot has a steep incline. All lots are near the water of Tomales Bay and highly constrained in terms of septic system expansion. While perhaps we residents of Balmoral Way should consider it an honor to be listed as the epicenter of underutilized residential units in Inverness, alas, it is an error by those who compiled the list and is divorced from reality. In summary, as a simple factual matter, the housing stock on Balmoral Way in Inverness is fully-built-up and fully-utilized and should not be listed as "underutilized"; all the Balmoral Way addresses on the "underutilized" list should be removed. Thank you for your kind consideration of this request to correct clear and obvious factual errors in the county's data.	Email	х							x					x			
Inverness, Cottages at Point Reyes Parcel	1982 storms, which unleashed large amounts of mud and rock, and woody detritus, into the bottomlands, and it is unstable as far as landslide danger (take note of the problems on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. above). Without any doubt, these events will be repeated in the future. For these reasons alone, this is one of the least appropriate areas for future housing. Douglas (Dewey) Livingston	Email									х	х		х				
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	I think that the proposed low cost housing sites and sizes and the solution is not thought out! For instance, the 98 homes in Woodacre would create a huge traffic problem and also be inappropriate. The Olema location and proposal would ruin the nature of Olema! And Dennis Rodoni lives in Olema! The west Marin area has been protected for a reason! The nature and small town is the reason that we are all here! I've lived here for 46 years and believe that it would be more appropriate to absorb the housing on properties that are all ready developed and make it attractive for homeowners to build ADUs Please revise the thinking around this important topic of affordable housing!	Email								x		x						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	and an 85 foot width, the length would be +/-265 feet, far larger than any current commercial building in Fairfax or San Anselmo with the exception of Safeway and Rite Aid in Red Hill Shopping Center. Onsite parking would certainly be required because the location is 100% auto-dependent. A minimum of 5-7 acres abutting County Open Space would be permanently lost. 3. A development of this size would likely require a significant sewer upgrade. Other infrastructure upgrades might also be necessary to handle an additional 90 households. There are +/-785 existing homes in Sleepy Hollow, so 90 units is a 10% increase in households overnight. A cost benefit analysis should be conducted to see if the project even pencilis out. And certainly, an EIR will be necessary. 4. The proposed location is in the wildlife urban interface (WUI) with elevated wildfire risk. Butterfield Road is only road in and out of Sleepy Hollow, and evacuation of residents in case of wildfire has been a major safety concern of the Sleepy Hollow Board for many years. The "Achilles Heel" of Sleepy Hollow is single point of ingress/egress. 5. There is inadequate public transportation to support a 90-unit development, particularly if 56 are "very low" and "low" income units. These households may lack a car, and the location is 100% auto-dependent. 6. The Sleepy Hollow location is over 5 miles to the nearest employment center in San Rafael, and is three miles from the nearest supermarket which is "upscale" (Good Earth) and expensive. It is over one mile to the nearest school, which is currently operating at near full capacity. 7. Of the proposed 90 units, 56 are "very low" and "low" income households, or over 50%. The median HH income is Sleepy Hollow is \$255,000, and the average housing price is around \$2 million. What formula is used to determine the number of "low" and "very-low" income households that go into a location?		х		x		х	x		x		x		x		x	x	
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	I live in Sleepy Hollow. I am concerned about the San Dominico site (which proposes adding 90 housing units to a community with ~800 households) for two main reasons. 1) Safety. Butterfield is a one way in one way out road. In case of evacuation, increasing the households by over 10% is troubling. Cars at the far end of Butterfield tend to speed. Adding more cars at the very end of the road significantly increases the risk of cars speeding. 2) Traffic. There is almost no public transportation on Butterfield. San Dominico already has a strict traffic commitment with the community because traffic is so bad. This would make it worse. There are three schools which adds to the traffic on Butterfield. Best practices for increasing housing is to do infill in urban areas. This is the opposite. It's building far away from public transportation and freeway access. What makes the most sense is to build as close to highway 101, bus terminals, Smart, etc.	Email				х		х						х				
L - 26500 Main Street (Tomales)	Your proposal to place 186 low-income units on this site is not fair nor does it make sense for the following reasons: You will take away a little league ball field currently used by the nearby communities. It may displace the early development center on the site. he immediate area already supports a section 8 housing community at the corner of North San Pedro and Schmidt Lane. This development will put an unfair burden on the surrounding neighborhood, here is a site at McPhail School down the road on North San Pedro that accommodate the same number of units without removing the little league field and have less visibility to the nearby neighborhood. As stated in another comment, Bon Air shopping center could accommodate most if not all of these units.	Email			x					х								
Lucas Valley	I do not support the proposed quantity of housing proposed for Lucas Valley. I am concerned about water resources, evacuation congestion in a fire, lack of services for new people in the area, increased road congestion and increased wildfire risk. This is not a NIMBY response. The Rotary Village is a great example of affordable housing for seniors that is near our community which is lovely. Expanding this type of housing would be welcome. Highrises are not welcome as they do not fit-in with our area. greatly reduced quantity of one or two story homes would be welcome. Why are we targeted with such a large percentage of the proposed housing? This is not an equitable plan. thought the Governor wanted housing in urban centers where services were available. Your plan does not meet this key criteria.	Email			x	х				х		х		Х	х		х	
Lucas Valley	I have resided in Upper Lucas Valley since 1986. Part of the appeal when I purchased here was the rural setting. Although I understand the need for housing, high density housing is inappropriate for Marin, i.e. large multi-unit structures. I welcome the addition of single family residences as many younger people need homes here desperately. I'm not sure where they would be situated in this area, but am open to suggestions. When George Lucas proposed affordable housing further down Lucas Valley Road, the main concern was the lack of transportation, grocery stores, and the other necessities. It made no sense. Another suggestion would be to make it possible for seniors to give (not sell) their larger homes to their children, purchase smaller homes and retain their property tax base. Most people in that position don't/can't move because buying a smaller home for \$1+ million brings with it property taxes they would find unaffordable. The only way it is currently possible is to sell your existing home and buy a cheaper one. When thinking of housing, perhaps the smart thing to do is build an area of affordable homes in the 1100-1500 square foot range for seniors. That would free up many, many existing homes for growing families.	Email			x			X									х	
Lucas Valley	I just want to officially voice my opposition to the development of additional homes in the Lucas Valley area. While I support the development of affordable housing in Marin County, protecting our undeveloped green spaces is an even higher priority. Instead, I believe areas that have already been developed (green space replaced with concrete) such as towns in southern Marin or places like Northgate Mall would be better options for new housing. Our undeveloped green spaces are priceless and irreplaceable!	Email								х		х						
Lucas Valley	It's come to my attention the HOA to which I belong is objecting to proposed increased housing in Lucas Valley. I would like to inform you that the Lucas Valley HOA is not uniform in this opinion. There are members, such as myself, that would welcome additional housing in Lucas Valley. While I found some of the HOA's arguments moderately persuasive (especially with regard to access to public transportation), I believe the need for more affordable housing in Marin trumps all of their points. I encourage you to keep Lucas Valley on your radar for proposed housing sites, and to find ways to encourage and incentivize more public transportation in our community.	Email						Х									х	х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1							_	_								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential housing in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2, Juvenile Detention Center/Leanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer: High Wildfirer Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in modern ar	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		x		x				x		×	x	×	x		x	
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	wildlire-prone areas and closer to urban centers.	Email										Х		Х				
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	Due to FIRE danger and Drought please stop more construction in Mount Marin and Lucas Valley.	Email							1	1				Х	Х			oxdot
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I am against housing development down Lucas valley and Marinwood. The weather here gets windy starting in spring and ends in the late fall. The surrounding mountains can catch on fire as we had a small one last year. With the drought we are already under rationing. A spark can create a fire and the wind will carry it all over the place. There are no exits except Lucas Valley road and in case of a fire it will be difficult for all to evacuate. Most locations you are considering are in heavily populated areas. Where would we go in case of a fire? 101 will be impacted. Yes we need affordable housing, not more multi million dollar homes. If the water department would consider building a desalination plant off the bay of San Francisco it would help us out. We are in global warming and more cars on the road and more pollution will set us back. What about the empty land space between Novato and Petaluma?	Email				х				x				х	х	х	х	
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I am extremely concerned about the proposed new developments in the Lucas Valley Marinwood area, especially when taken together with other large new development projects in the nearby vicinity. I realize California has a housing issue. However, destroying existing communities is not the solution. The number of added housing units in the LVM area alone will utterly destroy our school system. The Mill Creek School district currently serves about 2000 students. Just one proposal would add 1800 homes and possibly triple our student needs. Where will these children go to school? Similarly, almost 250 homes in the Prandi location would increase the Lucas Valley Elementary school population by a similar 200%. This will overwhelm our schools, and other community services. If there is another huge build at the Northgate site, also in the Miller Creek School district, it was even worse. I'm also worried about many environmental considerations that seem to be ignored. One has only to look at the debacle of the Talus development to see that these plans are not in the interest of the community or environment. These were not affordable homes for teachers and firefighters, but large expensive homes with big lots. Now we have a razed hillside, threats to our creek, destruction of few remaining heritage trees and wildlife habitar and one giant fire hazard with an enormous pile of dead trees and brush. This is what happens when projects are rammed through without proper review and oversight. Traffic increases will be a nightmare. In an emergency, how do we escape with the gridlocks that will occur? Lucas Valley Road and 101 are already jammed with cars especially at commute times. We are in continuing drought, unlikely to ever improve thanks to climate change. Where does the water come from for this new population? A few of the proposed sites make sense but this large scale unbalanced load into our small community does not. Any development should be tailored to fit the need (ie truly affordable housing, not a token 5%) and addre	Email			×					x		x		×			x	
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I am writing in regards to the proposed multi unit housing in Unincorporated Marin County. I'm against using open space to build housing. The site in the open space on Lucas Valley Road should be used for a community park or sports center for the community. Kids need a place to go that could include Basketball, Swimming, Playstructure and lawn for families. I understand the need for additional affordable and Multi-Family housing in Marin, but why Open Space? The County should be looking to improve areas that need improvement, not use open space to pour concrete and build multi level boxes. What about repurposing and improving small strip mall areas all along the freeways? These building have small space and often times run down retail shops and turning those in to thriving shops with housing above. Several responsible counties and cities have successfully done this. Why can't Marin think this way? I don't understand it. Open space should remain open space or for public park use. Dilapidated buildings should should be improved to include affordable housing for the better of the community.	Email										x						
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I moved to San Rafael specifically to get out of the city and to avoid over congestion, traffic and over development. The proposed additional housing in Marinwood and Lucas Valley will detract from the exact reason I moved here. Over development of north bay is an issue - and just because there is land does not mean it should be developed, which will permanently change the character of the community and landscape. I was unable to sign the petition against the new development, so sending this email instead. Thanks.	Email				х				х		х						

r	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1					1		1	,								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. The Housing Distribution Scenario says: Ensure Countywide Distribution - really? It looks like a disproportionate amount of it is in unincorporated Marinwood/Lucas Valley - 3,569 units to be exact. And some things to remember: We are a fire danger area now that we have had a fire evacuation this last summer. And what happens to road traffic during an evacuation? And it they don't drive, what happens to them? And what about the Water Shortage in Marin County with conservation being the ONLY SOLUTION so far? It is my understanding that the builders of these units won't have to pay property tax. So what does THAT do to our schools? Fire Department? EMT? And who picks up the tabMarinwood/Lucas Valley homeowners? And do we pick up the tax tab for ALL THE UNINCORPORATED AREA of 3,569 units? Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities: Can the residents of these residents drive? Are they close to services, jobs, transportation and amenities? I don't think so, especially if they can't drive.	Email			х	х		х						х				
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	The 2022 Marin County Candidates site for Unincorporated Marin and especially Marinwood/ Lucas Valley/Silveria Ranch is absurd. It targets just 5 square miles with 80% of the housing allocation for affordable housing in one community WITHOUT essential planning for schools, roads, government services, water, sewer and other essential services. Why "plan to fail"? Shouldn't a good faith effort to build affordable housing in our community also include a comprehensive plan for accommodating growth? It doesn't. This is why it should be rejected today. Instead, let's address the core questions for growth AND the financial impact of adding massive amount of largely non profit housing to a single community WITHOUT ADDITIONAL TAX BASE. Marinwood/Lucas Valley currently has approximately 2700 housing units for 6000 residents. The proposed housing sites could add 2300 apartments and 5500 residents who ALL WILL NEED schools, water, government services, transportation, access to shopping, etc. Shouldn't a proper plan for growth precede approval for housing? One of the sites listed is Marinwood Plaza, our communities ONLY commercial plaza within walking distance for thousands of residents. If the plan for 160 units is approved, this would squeeze out a vital community center to the detriment of all. This is not including the problem of TOXIC WASTE contamination clean up suitable for residential dwelling is a long way off despite community pressure on the Regional Water Quality Control Board who will not enforce its own clean up orders on the current owners. Despite the harsh criticism of the RHNA process, I believe there is a real community desire for more affordable housing in a community that will be planned appropriately, won't redevelop our neighborhoods and utilize open spaces like Silveira Ranch, St Vincents and other sites. While everyone I know supports the idea of more housing, not a single one wants a poorly conceived plan that forces large housing projects without considering the impacts. Reject the current RHNA pl	Email		×	×					x		x				x		
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	х				х				х				
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.4: Consider Environmental Hazards: WATER AND WILDFIRE This pertains to most of Marin County. We have a limited supply of resources to accommodate doubling of the population of marinwood/Lucas valley.	Email								х		х						
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vinicent's School -1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge; 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in unitis in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in t				x	x				x		x			x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL				1		1		1	1	1							
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Lucas Valley / Mt. Muir Court	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential home building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2, Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3, 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors include: High Wildfire Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received PDF, pp. 173-178)		x		x				x		x	x	×	x		x	
Lucas Valley, Grady Ranch Development	Addendum to LVHA Housing Statement: EIR Traffic Impact Report Needed For Emergency Evacuations on Lucas Valley Road. The recent wildfire emergency evacuation of Upper Lucas Valley in 10/12/21 caused a logiam of traffic on the only road out, the 2-lane Lucas Valley Road. It has belatedly been brought to our attention that the Grady Ranch development, currently in works (224 housing units), also has Lucas Valley Road as their only exit in a wildfire emergency. When the units are complete, they could add another 300 - 500 cars in an emergency (footnote 1 below). Adding even hundreds of more vehicles onto Lucas Valley Road from the 338 new potential housing units projected, could prove disastrous (footnote 2 below). In addition, any traffic study in an EIR report would also have to take into consideration the potential for a significant number of ADU housing units within the corridor. Lucas Valley Road already seems to have all the traffic it can handle during an emergency evacuation. The LVHA would therefore request that a traffic study be done in advance of earmarking any significant number of additional housing units along the Lucas Valley Road corridor.	Email				x				x				X				
Lucas Valley, Mt. Muir Court	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I am extremely perturbed that plans are being made to build housing in within the wetlands and flood zone contained in the old Silveira ranch and St Vincent's properties. This wetlands will become increasingly important as the sea level rises and flood zones will be even less inhabitable year round. This will leave any housing there soon uninhabitable but some builder richer and some county officials who only went through the motions of actually providing affordable housing. This issue was already explored and sanity prevailed in leaving the wetlands to be wetlands. Any housing, affordable or otherwise, should be built on appropriate land, not a flood zone which will damage any housing built on it.	Email									х						х	
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		×	x					x							x	
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. St Vincent's School - 1800: NO Because there is little infrastructure at St. Vincents, including access to schools and public transportation, this is a poor site for development. Certainly not 1800 units which is an entire community. The only housing at St. Vincents should be limited to students (dorms) and staff.	Email		х	х			х		х								
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I hope that the Marinwood Plaza/market site is again under consideration for housing. As you most likely know, some 15 years or so ago, the community shot down an excellent proposal from Bridge Housing. Except for the market, the property remains a derelict eyesore. Many of us in Marinwood would like to see the property improved, including a modest amount of housing development, along with community amenities such as a coffee shop, brew pub, or other gathering place, and other shops such as hair salon, co-working space, etc. It is close to public transportation, schools, and major employers most notably Kaiser. It's a far superior site for development than the St Vincents property which has myriad sea level rise and other environmental challenges, and very little other infrastructure. I hope the property will be on be on tomorrow's meeting agenda.	Email		х							х	х						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I oppose 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. West Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.	Email															х	х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1			1	1 1	ı —	1	1			1		1			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I oppose a housing development the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. 1. West Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. 2. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. 3. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. 4. Building would ruin agricultural, rural beauty which is so precious to the San Geronimo Valley. 5. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Or work with the state to move San Quentin out to a more appropriate place for a prison such as barren land in the dessert, and make a beautiful development on the waterfront right next to shops and the ferry and the Richmond Bridge which would be easy access to transportation and would not overburden Sir Francis Drake which is already far too congested. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.	Email										x					х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. Then two of the sites are still contaminated from the former cleaners at Marinwood Market Plaza - St. Vincent's and Marinwood Market Plaza. So what happens with the housing planned in these locations?1936 units?	Email														Х		
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I think we should spend our time, energy and money on housing the homeless and low income people at the property near St. Vincents just south of Novato. As you may have noticed, people who work in our communities, but can not live here because of the cost, commute from Richmond and Vallejo and we see the traffic jams every day at commute times. I have heard of a toll coming for Hwy 37, making it even more costly for people who can not afford to live here.	Email																х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fnyy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters),530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I would	Email			x	х		X	х			x		X			×	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I'm writing to express concern about the proposal to put 1800 units of new housing at St Vincents in Lucas Valley. This number is incredibly high - it would overwhelm the Miller Creek School district. There are many other sites proposed in Lucas Valley. I'm not saying no to all of them, but this has got to get more reasonable. Please don't destroy what is now a beautiful community. Marinwood is a special place. We can't absorb all this housing - some please, but nowhere close to the number of units proposed.	Email			х					х								
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Public Feedback - Marinwood/St Vincents housing proposal: I was only recently made aware of the current preliminary proposal for housing allocation to the unincorporated areas of marin county. As a current resident who grew up in Marinwood Lucas Valley - left the county - and returned to raise my family here - I cannot more strongly oppose the sheer volume of proposed housing for the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas. This location (Marinwood/Lucas Valley) is already underserved by commercial services and has a lack of job opportunities. It is a small bedroom community sandwiched between the commercial hubs of San Rafael and Novato. Any significant shopping or professional services require a vehicle trip to either the city of San Rafael or to the city of Novato. The added burden of the new development proposals would grossly increase the negative environmental impacts that the lack of nearby commercial services already causes. Furthermore the 101 interchanges both North and South already can barely handle the traffic that exists. More housing in this area without addressing current school campus, sport field, open space, park and community center availability and other critical services would have a significant negative impact on the community and not balance the Supervisors stated goal of 'equitable distribution' throughout the county. The schools within the Miller Creek School District are also nearly at capacity. Many of the campuses operate with nearly a third of classrooms being in 'portable' classrooms and have had to take over outdoor recreation areas for portable classroom locations. Our youth sports also already operate at a deficit of field/court availability relative to the active youth that participate. I urge the planning department and the board of supervisors to re-evaluate the Marinwood/Lucas Valley area and not look to force nearly 60% of the county's unincorporated housing allotment into our small bedroom community.	Email			x	x				x		×						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				x				x				
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	х				x				х				
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; St Vincents is a large undeveloped area that could likely support some housing, but 1800 units does not limit building on open land.	Email								х		Х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1			_	1			_						-			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; St Vincents is a large undeveloped area that could likely support some housing, but 1800 units does not limit building on open land.	Email								х		х						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,659 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concern regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,14 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of auditional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in this				x	x				x		×			×			
Muir Woods Lodge (Tam Valley)	After much thought and consultation with some neighbors, I'd like to submit the motel that is across from the Holiday Inn – the Muir Woods Lodge – as a possible housing site. You may know that the previous motel next door – with the big sign that says "Fireside" was converted to housing some years ago. If the Muir Woods Lodge is similarly converted, it would not create much additional traffic, as the paterns are already established.	Email																х
Nazareth House (San Rafael)	Additionally, there are also at least two other projects (the 670-unit Northgate and 100-unit Nazareth House developments) which are within our school district but not in unincorporated Marin. Likewise, neither of these developments, both within the Miller Creek School District, will generate per pupil funding for either the Miller Creek K-8 schools or the San Rafael High School district. That means that even though there will be many more students to serve, there will be no additional funding with which to do so. Additionally, these developments generate little to no parcel tax money and some are even exempt from the meager development fees which means the District would receive no money at all to build additional classrooms or to hire additional teachers to serve all the additional students that would be generated.	Email			х													
No Location Specified (Countywide)	All should be near public transportation and shopping. Walking is good for all of us	Email						Х	Х									
No Location Specified (Countywide)	Any & all housing proposed in Marin county should be near public transportation and shopping. Adding additional cars to the area doesn't make environmental sense so low cost housing should be in convenient locations	Email			Х			Х										
No Location Specified (Countywide)	Any and all housing sites should consider availability of public transportation and availability of services, ie, grocery stores and pharmacies. It makes no sense to put any housing in out of the way sites where more cars are put on the road. Housing closer to hwy 101 is appropriate.	Email			Х			Х										<u></u>
No Location Specified (Countywide)	As I am sure, many of our concerns may have already been asked but there is a need better communicate the information to the community. The follow are questions/ concerns: Who performed the study to identify potential areas for the housing sites? What determines the income used for each Housing category (ie local income, county income, housing prices)? How will residence commute from there new homes? Mass/public transportation? Where will retail commerce be located? Will the county exercise Eminent Domain Power? Effect to local taxes, for local bond issues created as a result increased population (Schools, roads, sewers, law enforcement, fire protection other county servicers)?	Email		Х	x			х						х	х		х	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	homes when there are not enough resources for those that are already here? Also, with the State allowing easy addition of ADUs on existing properties, it appears that some housing needs will be unwittingly filled that way (along with additional strain on resources)	Email				х									х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I am urging you to not proceed with the presently proposed Housing Element plans in incorporated Marin County. While affordable housing is a concern, so is sustainability. I do not believe the current plan balances these needs adequately. Please allow time for a more thoughtful discussion with more public engagement before proceeding.	Email										х						
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I am very concerned about the large number of homes that the state is requiring Marin to build, with no local control. We are already short of water. Where do they think we will the supply for more homes. As a minimum any new building should only be done with companion infrastructure improvements to handle it such as water, traffic, local schools, etc. I believe there should be push back to the state legislature regarding push to urbanize many parts of our county without thought or planning for the effects of such building.	Email		х	х	х				х					х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I do not think there should be housing put into rural meadows but should concentrate on areas that are near existing commercial or developed areas that are not being used. Why change Marin to be like other congested counties that have houses Everywhere willy-nilly and people have to have cars and use gas to get anywhere they need to go? Marin County has a beautiful and peacefulness in the open meadows and hillsides. Please don't jeopardize the county by putting the housing along open space meadowlands and hillsides.	Email										х						<u> </u>
	I find your proposals rushed and not well thought out. I am in favor of taking a more thoughtful and balanced approach.	Email	l .	Ī	i	1	l .	1	1	i	1	Ì					1	

•	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I fully support measures to increase housing in Marin County, especially those targeted for low income housing. I reject the disguised racism and NIMBY attitude present among naysayers, even if it were to depress my own home's value. I support both racial and economic diversity as a strength of our community. It's unconscionable that wealthy Marin residents want the best schools, but don't want low paid teachers to be able to afford to also live here. This goes double for housecleaners, yard workers, and other very low wage workers who have to spend a significant portion of their income commuting. Let's stand up to the madness of a vocal few and do the right thing.	Email															x	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I like how an unelected board (ABAG) comes up with this huge number and threatens the county with a big stick. Never mind the additional water resources that would be needed for all these new residents in a drought prone area.	Email													х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	Marin Housing authority, It seems like the enthusiasm to push this through the County is ignoring a grievous situation. Already, even with water limitations, the County is poorly prepared to grow without greater water resources. This is truly the 'elephant in the middle of the room'. No expansion on this scale can possible be discussed without responsible delivery of adequate water. Thank you for considering my voice.	Email													х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	My primary concern is the same one I always have: how will increasing housing affect the environment? A number of sites would require cutting down trees or building close to streams. We need MORE trees, preferably native oaks, to protect soil, reduce moisture loss, & provide shade. Open space is NOT wasted space. Talking about affordable housing sounds good, but I keep seeing huge vanity houses being built. There's a 4,000 ft2 just down the road from me that stands empty most of the time. All that construction required scarce building materials and created lots of air & noise pollution. Is slapping an affordable-housing tag on these projects just another sneaky way for people to invest in real estate? How does packing people into fire-prone areas make sense? What about drought and the impact of more construction & people? Why not buy back or forbid the ownership of 2nd & 3rd homes? Why not build housing in strip malls? Disrespecting the environment is how we got into this mess.	Email										х		X		х	х	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	My view is that the changes proposed will change the character of this lovely region	Email										х						
No Location Specified (Countywide)	The county of Marin has reached peak density due to water and transportation constraints. Minimal new housing should be constructed in Marin County. The housing problem is a statewide problem and it should be addressed at the state level. New cities should be constructed along the Hwy. 5 and 99 corridors near the planned high speed rail lines. The state also needs to build treatment centers for the mentally ill and the drug addicted individuals that are currently living on the streets. These centers can also be placed where land and resources are less expensive. The current uncoordinated county by county plans will only decrease the quality of life and increase expenses for all.	Email			х	x		х		х					х		х	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	We are being asked to find housing numbers 19k what we were asked in the last planning cycle. Why? If this is because ABAG is, once again trying to the Marin housing numbers to SF through their "sphere of influence" concept, this has already been disproven, since Marin is not a bedroom community to SF. ABAG needs to understand that they cannot just wave their magic wand, and buildable lots appear! Affordable Housing needs are real, and Marin has been a very expensive place to live, both in housing costs and in cost of food, gas and everything else, so we are not a very affordable place to live, even once housed, ites with sea level rise issues should not be considered for new housing. Period. Building housing for the disadvantaged in these areas is not social justice, or even good planning. Parking on site is a must in Marin, regardless of any loopholes in SB9. Especially on the hills, where the streets are substandard, parking on the streets has already created impossible access for fire and other emergency vehicles, or even 2-way traffic. This has been caused by the County neglecting to demand the roads be improved before development went in. These are death traps in the event of the fire we know will come some day! Planning has allowed development to continue on substandard roads, particularly on hills. This poor planning has created fire traps throughout the county that people will not be able to evacuate from. These sites should also not be further developed, especially for those in need, without adding the infrastructure that will insure the safety of the residents, is adequate roads that can handle an evacuation. Other infrastructure needs to be updated to handle increased demands, such as sewers, to meet the unplanned expansions mandated by SB (How will we meet these sea level rise impacting existing housing and major roads, and fire. While we are redesigning these we may have opportunities to find new housing sites. I hear the Strawberry Seminary has sold its property. There is a vast opportunity for a	Email		×		x	x				x	×		x	x		x	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	We are being asked to find housing numbers 19x what we were asked in the last planning cycle. Why? If this is because ABAG is, once again trying to tie Marin housing numbers to SF through their "sphere of influence" concept, this has already been disproven, since Marin is not a bedroom community to SF. ABAG needs to understand that they cannot just wave their magic wand, and buildable lots appear!	Email											i					
No Location Specified (Countywide)	We should not be approving any more new developments without increasing our water supply.	Email													х			
No Location Specified (East Marin)	Please keep the housing developments in east Marin as our beloved former politicians planned in the early 1960's as detailed in the documentary "Rebels with a Cause".	Email										Х						
No Location Specified (San Geronimo and Nicasio)	Dear Board of Supervisors, I am writing to thank you and the County staff for the outstanding work you have been doing on the new Housing Element for Marin County. I especially appreciate the community education and outreach by the County to actively engage residents during these past few months. The workshops on the Housing Element and the Balancing Act tool offered important information on the unmet need for affordable housing and also the criteria that could to be used as guides in the decision-making process. I also want to thank Leelee Thomas and the entire Community Development Agency staff for the virtual workshop on February 16th for unincorporated West Marin. More than 100 people attended, many with purposeful, well-informed questions. Leelee and staff responded to all of the questions in a knowledgeable, meaningful and insightful manner. In addition to housing sites, It was good to hear that County staff are working to try and find solutions to some of the most vexing issues that impede and discourage the creation of affordable homes: septic issues, waste treatment and grey water systems, and building code and zoning restrictions. I very much appreciate your dedication and support of affordable housing in Marin. We all have a lot of work to do. Attached are my ideas about possible sites for affordable housing sites in the San Geronimo Valley and Nicasio. (Note: attachment apparently not included)	Email															х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		,	,	1		1						-	-				
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
No Location Specified (San Geronimo Valley?)	Increasing the potential for 200+ more cars getting through the SFD corridor during rush hour? Traffic is already a nightmare morning and night. Adding houses to a community struggling to maintain homeowners insurance due to wildfire vulnerability? This is really poor thinking and poor planning. I support seeking SOME alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations but there are possibilities along the 101 corridor that make much more sense. Please think forward instead of short sightedly.	Email				х								х				
No Location Specified (West Marin)	I agree with and adopt as my own the comments submitted by the Environmental Action Committee of West Marin (EAC), and request that you add my name in support of EAC's position. And additionally, and by all means, Marin County MUST maintain the zoning (A-60) and all other policies designed to protect and enhance agriculture in West Marin. (Note: unable to identify EAC comments which are referred to.)	Email										х						
No Location Specified (West Marin)	I am extremely concerned about more housing going up in West Marin due to fire danger and the already impossible likelihood of getting out of Marin from West Marin due to the lack of roads to get out. How can more housing be considered when there are only a couple ways out and if traffic in Fairfax is bottled up and the ONLY way out is going east then valley residents are screwed. Housing should only be considered in areas nearest the freeways. The golf course should only be for open space and recreation. Fire danger is a serious threat.	Email				х						х		x				
No Location Specified (West Marin)	In West Marin we are on septic systems. It is horrendously expensive to get anything done here., costing up to \$ 100,000 easily for a simple system. Then the County is imposing annual extra fees for people who have non standard systems of any kind. It makes this unfeasible for all but the most wealthy. I and many of my neighbors would be amenable to putting an ADU on our property BUT for the septic issues. There are alternatives - electric toilets, or other things that could be researched. Also, the County must come up with an affordable septic pricing. Plus, the contractors have no incentive to keep their costs in line, even with their proposals. I have heard time and again, how Questa got a bid, must have been the lowest bid, then they went over budget, (by \$15,000 or \$ 20,000) and to get the house signed off, approved, and be able to move in, the homewomer paid the extortion, I mean, bill. The County could at least provide a service where homeowners could put their comments in about septic contractors for prospective septic owners to see. Thanks for listening.	Email													x			
No Location Specified (West Marin)	The consideration of this site (275 Olive Avenue) raises a concern that other similarly inappropriate sites may also be up for consideration in other parts of Marin. Would it be possible to get a list of any sites that are within 500 feet of a wetland? I studied wetland habitat restoration planning in graduate school, and was under the impression that CEQA/CWA sect 404 prevented projects from being built on top of or close to wetlands.	Email										х						
Northgate Development (San Rafael)	Additionally, there are also at least two other projects (the 670-unit Northgate and 100-unit Nazareth House developments) which are within our school district but not in unincorporated Marin. Likewise, neither of these developments, both within the Miller Creek School District, will generate per pupil funding for either the Miller Creek K-8 schools or the San Rafael High School district. That means that even though there will be many more students to serve, there will be no additional funding with which to do so. Additionally, these developments generate little to no parcel tax money and some are even exempt from the meager development fees which means the District would receive no money at all to build additional classrooms or to hire additional teachers to serve all the additional students that would be generated.	Email			x													
Novato, Atherton Corridor	Hello. Thank you for the information and materials regarding the Housing Element on the website. I have reviewed all of the materials and have the following questions the answers to which will help me and others comment and provide input in a more informed way. Because of the 1,000 character limit, this is the 1st of 3 emails with 9 total questions. The Draft Candidate Sites Inventory charts you have provided do not break-out extremely low-, very low-, and low-income units. The Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook under Government Code Section 65583.2 (the "Guidebook") seems to require this, and Marin County's FAQ 15 breaks down the 3,569 total into those 3 categories plus moderate and above moderate. Can you please provide that more defined breakdown of all 5 categories by site? 1. It would be very helpful to have a chart for the Draft Candidate Sites Inventory that lists the units under each of the four scenarios. Is that something you have? Can you please provide it? 2. Under Part A. Step 3 please provide the availability or plans for the Atherton Corridor sites. 3. Under Part A, Step 6 please provide the factors considered to accommodate low and very low-income housing for all of the sites. 4. Under Part B, for the Atherton Corridor sites, please provide the evidence that the site is realistic and feasible for lower income housing. 5. Is there a master plan for all of the low-income housing, up to 516 units, for the Atherton Corridor? Does any plan consider sidewalks, traffic lights, parking spaces and public transit? How many buildings and floors on each site are envisioned? 6. Under Part C, the capacity analysis, and in particular Step 2, what were the factors to calculate the realistic capacity of the Atherton Corridor sites including redevelopment of the non-vacant sites? 7. Under Part D, why are the non-vacant sites in the Atherton Corridor considered "obsolete" or "substandard" or otherwise meet the required criteria? 8. Under Part D, Step 3A, what is the basis for finding that the current residen	Email	×	×													x	
Novato, Atherton Corridor	How would you feel if the County identified your home as the possible site for rezoning to accommodate high-density housing but neglected to notify you??? And then justified its inaction as inconsequential because the properties are only under preliminary consideration. That's what happened in the Community Development Agency's Feb. 17 presentation. I call it arrogant, insensitive, high-handed and totally inappropriate. Furthermore, the process of identifying these properties is opaque at best. It is irresponsible to proceed while disregarding the infrastructure necessary to support new homes, particularly in our drought-stressed, fire-endangered landscape. It's not the kind of government that respects its citizens. I am particularly troubled that the planning for the Atherton unincorporated areas ignores the Fireman's Fund 1000-home development in Novato less than a mile away. Dumping 1400 homes into this concentrated area spells disaster and will overwhelm the San Marin-Atherton interchange.* The "Guiding Principles" you adopted in December include "environmental hazards," but they recklessly disregard the practicalities of building on these sites and the adverse impact on the local environment, it's time to go back to the drawing boards and this time develop a reality-based plan that honors your constituents. "Construction of 101 in the Novato Narrows has taken 20+ years! Nothing should proceed until CalTrans is on board with a plan and dollars committed!	Email	х	х						х		х		x				
Novato, Unincorporated	We live in unincorporated Novato and the consensus of my neighborhood is that we do not wish to have our area re-zoned to accommodate low-income housing. What's unique about our area is that we still have some room to support the local wildlife and insects. Since moving here in 2014, we've witnessed a decline in the bee, bumblebee, and butterfly populations. The Monarchs will soon be gone do due to dwindling food resources. They are key to the health of our ecosystem, and every time a property is developed for housing, the plants needed to support these creatures are destroyed. Fencing also hurts the trails and pathways necessary for the animals to get much-needed food and water. We do not want you re-zoning anything. We want to keep our neighborhoods as they are. We already struggle with water issues. Please do not make our areas more accessible for development. We do not want what little beauty is left here destroyed.	Email										X			x			

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x			x					x	x		x			x	
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level of Service – LOS "Fo of Local Roadways: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health im	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		х		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1				1	1 1										$\overline{}$	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious liliness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		X	x	x	x		x		x	x	х	x	x	x	х		
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					х			х				, L
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. Given the County's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals is completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10), 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative investment: Eliminate corporate ownership	Email																
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	I am in complete support of all the points made in Sustainable Tam Almonte letter of 2/24/22. Building in the proposed area is ill advised, and appears to be illegal.  I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the	Email								Х	Х							
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	х	х	x	х		Х		х	х	х	х	x	x	x		<u> </u>

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL					1	, ,											
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingo Rd. he site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than pr	Email				x		×			x							
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				х					х			Х				
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodríguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)—that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				x					х	х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	(Comment edited for length) Please find attached the San Geronimo Valley Planning Group's response to the proposed Housing Element update. Background: The San Geronimo Valley Planning Group was formed in 1972 to help elect Gary Giacomini to the Board of Supervisors in order to gain the critical third vote necessary to kill the 1961 Countywide Master Plan, which had envisioned 5,000 new homes and 20,000 additional residents for the San Geronimo Valley alone. While the plan was updated in 1982 and 1997, its central premise has never changed: preserving our Valley's rural character and protecting our natural environment. This commitment - along with that of many other community members - also helped permanently preserve more than 2,300 acres of open space in our beloved Valley. We have been trying to apprehend the efforts of Marin County to meet the state- mandated 'housing elements' through the rezoning of existing parcels. We are very concerned that few Valley residents are aware of the potential impact of this housing mandate on our community and that the Planning Group was not included in the process from the beginning. Apparently, pressure from the State has made it a top-down County effort. The Planning Group adamantly opposes the proposed, potential locations within our community identified below. High school property - We are alarmed by Candidate Housing Site P, the proposal to build 98 above-moderate-income units through rezoning the high school property ent to the Ottolini/Flanders' Ranch at the bottom of White's Hill on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Our Community Plan clearly spells out that the use of this property should remain as agriculture or open space, the high school district agreed. Our reasons are numerous. 1. It would be a visual blight, destroying not only the aesthetics of the entrance to our Valley but also jamming suburbia into the inland rural corridor. 2. It would be a visual blight, destroying not only the aesthetics of the entrance to our Valley but also jamming suburbia into the inland rur				×	x	x			х		х					x	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	1: can we use the Lagunitas school parcel that is before the Spirit Rock parcel? 2: If Spirit Rock is built on can it be hidden from road? 3: The visual view when you enter the Valley is gorgeous and should be maintained. 4: Lagunitas school campus has lots of unused space.	Email										х						Х
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	98 houses on the San Geronimo Valley floor is a terrible idea. It would ruin the beauty of the valley which Valley residents have worked so hard over the years to preserve. Please help us we would be most grateful if you could find other sites for these needed homes. Grateful for your attention to this.	Email								х		х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Already leaving here is problematic early in the morning and many folks work and go to school over the hill and have to go then. You would be adding probably 200 or so cars to the problem for starters. As it is I no longer go to Point Reyes on the weekends because its an extremely busy place full of tourists and the locals cant park and get to services. Dennis, I have written to you before regarding the San Geronimo Valley Golf Course and you can see now that what was once a beautiful sward of land full of animals and birds and yes golfers is now a sea of weeds and fallen trees. And yes, people walk there on the paths and I guess through the tick invested grasses as well. And now you want to put up 98 (!) houses and destroy another piece of the Valley? And what about fire and earthquake considerations. If that corridor gets blocked in an emergency we would all try to get out through Lucas Valley or perhaps Highway One but regardless its scary to think of those situations. And I was here when we fought to keep that all all the other developments a NO GO. Successfully might I add and I believe the plan states that land was to stay agricultural. And how are you going to get all those folks home insurance? I already know people who have been denied coverage here and several of those companies I believe want to leave California altogether. Surely you can find another spot to meet whatever criteria is mandated some place else. I dont know if you even bother to read these letters but I do want to go on record objecting wholeheartedly to this.	Email				х						х		х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Dear Mr. Rodini please do your best to represent the better interest of all Valley residents and don't let 98 new houses be Built-in the area East of Woodacre along San Francisco Drake. The San Geronimo Valley has one road in-and-out and Our septic systems and fire protection issues are at stake! Please say no!	Email				х								х	Х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Hello Dennis, I am writing as a long term resident in Woodacre with some concern regarding the 50 acre parcel alongside SFD Blvd and the Flanders ranch property. Please include all San Geronimo residents in any planning that might go forward on this horrendous possibility for 98 homes. We are already struggling with water issues, fire issues, septic issues, road access in emergencies, current Fairfax traffic jams. We already have a valley floor jammed with County infrastructure - water dept, fire dept, PGE substation, noise and lights all times of day and night. I certainly hope this possibility will become part of many public forums on your agenda for this small and fragile valley. Since the last fire on White's Hill, nothing has been done to remove the battery box from the long-broken highway sign which may have sparked that fire. I think, in speaking to my neighbors, the SGV feels a bit neglected by your office and I sincerely hope that can be rectified.	Email				х				х				x	x			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I am a homeowner in Woodacre since 1972. I am of the opinion that there are some places that shouldn't be developed. I include all of western Marin in that category, but for the moment I will comment on the proposed development of 98 homes just west of White Hill on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Entering the valley, one's first impression is the beautiful rural landscape that is becoming rare in California. That experience would be negatively impacted by any development in that area. 98 Homes would mean around 200 automobiles adding to the congestion in Fairfax and San Anselmo and create a great deal more air pollution than already exists. That area is not only a seasonal wetland, but is in the headwaters of the Lagunitas Creek Watershed. Construction and habitation of that area would cause irreparable harm to wildlife, including endangered salmonids and many other species. I support development along the 101 corridor.	Email				х				х		X		х	х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I am a resident and homeowner in Forest Knolls, where I live with my husband and 5 year old. I'm responding to signs I saw posted today along SFD near Dickson Ranch, in regard to the building of 98 homes on that property. I have searched online and cannot find any more information about this proposal. I would like to add my comment that you please proceed very cautiously—while I really recognize the need for more housing and more affordable housing in Marin, I have a couple of big concerns—environmental impact (including air quality, native species habitat preservation and restoration, and light pollution. I also have some concern about SFD as the only way into and out of the valley, in case of emergency (and, just in terms of general traffic congestion, and air pollution). So my comment is to please very carefully consider these matters before proceeding. Thank you!	Email				х						X		х		X		
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I am dead set against the proposal to develop 98 new houses on the 50 acre High School property. Such a large development is exactly the kind of change the valley has fought against for decades. Such a large development would change the Valley's pastoral character enormously and negatively. I believe the Valley's population stands around 3,500. If 4 people were to live in each house of such a new village, the valley's population would increase over 10% overnight. I would support fewer than half such units of low-income housing if they were located in dispersed fashion, and wouldn't have such a negative aesthetic consequences.	Email								х		х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I believe West Marin has reached its carrying capacity for new homes, especially in regards to water, roads, septic and fire safety. Are we going for maximum buildout? What happens after we add 3500 homes the State of California tells we have to do? What happens in 2031 when they say we have to do it again? I watched the zoom meeting with Leelee Thomas on February 16, and she said it's either the carrot or the stick. I did not see any carrots in the equation, only threats. The proposed 98 houses in the heart of the San Geronimo Valley is an ill conceived proposal. It does not take into consideration that the plot of land is the headwaters of the Lagunitas Creek which is a coho salmon nursery. It's a flood plain when we get substantial rain - if you have ever driven by in a downpour, the entire area is a web of small streams before it gets to the main stream channel about 500 feet from there. I believe the infrastructure needed for those houses would not only be an eyesore, but also a detriment to our fragile ecosystem.	Email		x		х				х	х	х		x	х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I could not access the Balancing Site work area so I am submitting these comments here. SGV is am amazing place to be due to low development. I have had the benefit of living here 25 years. What is being proposed in both of the areas of the School property and at the Gold Course are for higher end homes. Higher end homes are not a help for our community. We need homes for families with kids, We need Senior housing. We don't need another 127 above moderate income homes. Have some vision. Create a place with a grocery store, deli, and place for people to meet. Create Senior housing. Have ability to share vehicles. This area could become a hub for our community to use and support. It is also a sensitive environmental area. It used to be where water would spread out when it rained and slowly sink into the ground providing water all year round for the fish. More concrete and asphalt = more runoff. This vision of 98 separate high end homes here is not fitting to the rural area of our valley. It is just going to bring in more people who want a rural lifestyle from other areas and NOT give our locals homes. Every day, people, and families are looking for homes. Renters are being pushed out. It is unaffordable to live here. Solve the problem we have now, housing for our locals. Not bring more people here. Also, the place being considered at 6900 Sir Francis Drake is a privately owned place. Owned by a family that owns quite a bit of property in the Valley as it is. I certainly hope public monies are not going to rehab this property.									х		X					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character and the beauty we prize in that view shed. I support seeking alternative Valley sites not visible from Sir Francis Drake Blvd to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I believe many of these West Marin sites are not strategic due to environmental concerns, lack of local jobs, and inadequate infrastructure to sustain such a population increase. I support seeking alternative Marin sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email		х	х					х		x						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations. We are already working to provide affordable housing for people here in the San Geronimo Valley. Please work with our group to create homes and units that are an integral part of our existing villages. Continue to preserve our open, agricultural spaces and the green belt that surrounds this rural part of Marin county.	Email								×		Х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative sites to meet our affordable housing obligations. Supervisor Rodoni- You have been a supporter of the environment and the agg culture of Marin. I know we need housing in Marin, but this is the wrong spot for 98 houses especially without any transit options for residents in that development.	Email						х		х		Х						
Valley)																		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1		1		-		,		,				-	- 1	<del></del>	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do NOT support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do NOT support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								X		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								Х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								X		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do NOT support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. Not to mention the massive increase in traffic and fire hazard/danger such a development would create. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email				Х				X		X						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support new housing on the 50-acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. This important rural gateway property to the valley and nearby Pt Reyes National Seashore should remain in agricultural use as part of the historical Flanders Ranch. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations. Our community will vigorously oppose such inappropriate development.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I hate to hear that 98 houses are going to be built on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. I do support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations, and hope that some compromise can be reached that won't destroy the beautiful approach to West Marrin or further stress our limited resources. I know we are lucky to have remained untouched by "progress" for so long but oh boy I hope our luck holds a bit longer. Anything you can do to stop this unwelcome and depressing development will be much appreciated.	Email								Х		Х			х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I have lived in Woodacre for over 40 years. I love the contry feel and woodsy environment. I highly object to the proposed low income housing development on Flanders property. I am your constituent, and voted for you when you were running for office. Please stop any expansion, re-zoning or building projects that will bring more residences to the Valley. I travel down San Geronimo Valley drive every day as, I work in San Rafael. When I get to the corner of Sir Francis Drake, I would be looking at the very piece of land across SFD, that the houses will be built on A. I understand the proposal, 100 houses will be built on 50 acres. The new development will also add to traffic on SFD by quite a bit. Please, let's keep the beautiful rural nature of the Valley as it is now.					х				х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I hope you're well and please allow me to begin by thanking you for your leadership on a range of issues important to San Geronimo Valley residents. While I know the recent report about possible locations for additional housing in the county is quite preliminary (and conducted by a third party that does not speak for Marin County residents), it makes sense that concerned citizens speak loudly and early on this topic. Please know that I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre high school property facing Sir Francis Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character. It would destroy the beauty we prize in coming over White's Hill. It would create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. Most important, it would add a possible 200 additional vehicles and possibly up to one thousand daily vehicle trips in and out of the valley to an already congested road. Anyone trying to get to Highway 101 at 8:00 am already knows that the traffic is horrible as you enter Fairfax. This would add to that exponentially. Anyone living on or near SFD Blvd. knows that the weekends are equally tough with many tourists heading to and from the coast. While I support affordable housing I believe there are better ways and better locations to accomplish this.	Email				х				Х		Х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I just want to add my voice to ask you not to support the new San Geronimo housing being considered. The environmental and infrastructure impact will be horrible!	Email		Х								х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I oppose 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo ValleyWest Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.	Email				x				x		х		х	х		х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I oppose a housing development the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. 1. West Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. 2. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. 3. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. 4.Building would ruin agricultural, rural beauty which is so precious to the San Geronimo Valley. 5. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Or work with the state to move San Quentin out to a more appropriate place for a prison such as barren land in the dessert, and make a beautiful development on the waterfront right next to shops and the ferry and the Richmond Bridge which would be easy access to transportation and would not overburden Sir Francis Drake which is already far too congested. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.					х				х	х	х		x	х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I support adding housing in appropriate locations. I do not believe the west side of White's Hill, on Tamalpais School property is appropriate. The area is prone to flooding and is vital for supporting the flow of water in the creeks that are used by salmon. Also, the county plan has been to add housing on the 101 corridor, leaving west Marin rural. As a member of the Valley Emergency Response Team, I am concerned about adding so many more cars on the road, ensuring a bottleneck in the event of an emergency evacuation.	Email									х	х		х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I support adding housing in appropriate locations. I do not believe the west side of White's Hill, on Tamalpais School property is appropriate. The area is prone to flooding and is vital for supporting the flow of water in the creeks that are used by salmon. Also, the county plan has been to add housing on the 101 corridor, leaving west Marin rural. As a member of the San Geronimo community, I am concerned about adding so many more cars on the road, ensuring a bottleneck in the event of an emergency evacuation.	Email									х	х		х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I think that the proposed low cost housing sites and sizes and the solution is not thought out! For instance, the 98 homes in Woodacre would create a huge traffic problem and also be inappropriate. The Olema location and proposal would ruin the nature of Olema! And Dennis Rodoni lives in Olema! The west Marin area has been protected for a reason! The nature and small town is the reason that we are all here! I've lived here for 46 years and believe that it would be more appropriate to absorb the housing on properties that are all ready developed and make it attractive for homeowners to build ADUs Please revise the thinking around this important topic of affordable housing!	Email				x				x		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I'm not sure if this is accurate, but we have heard a site for 98 new homes is being proposed at the base of Whites Hill. We can only hope this is not true as that would be disastrous for the area and environment, and truly spoil the natural surroundings	Email										Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	It has come to my attention, either from neighborly chats or from other sources, there is a potential plan taking shape to add housing to the San Geronimo Valley. Specifically close to 100 houses on the land we refer to as "Flander's Field", where there was once a plan for a high school. That plan didn't materialize, as this valley began to be more declarative and assertive in stating the vision for this area, and guidelines for what is / is not acceptable development. When I moved to the valley 25 years ago, I thought it might be a place to stay for a couple of years. But after understanding this community better, and listening to our elders, I came to understand and appreciate what our environmental advocates have been fighting for and diligently guarding. This is the reason I still live here today. In my home town, I watched as the cherry trees toppied, the apple orchards fell, and the planting fields gave way to urbanization and development. It still breaks my heart whenever I drive through and see the Police Station, Post Office, County Buildings and parking lots where I once played with my friends and frolicked with my dog. I am filled with such gratitude to live here in the San Geronimo Valley, comforted in knowing this place is truly special. Magical. I now take up the fight to preserve our natural beauty and the ecosystems that depend on limits to growth. My neighbor refers to entering the valley as the "Chitty Bang Bang effect", where the wheels of the car roll up under you and you start to float along in the last part of your journey home. Please help us keep this natural beauty as opposed to a Shitty Shitty first impression entering this sacred place. Also, this would impact and devastate what little is left of our natural habitat for spawning salmonI've witnessed and taken part in many debates and county board meetings to force the stoppage of building homes due to this deleterious impact. 98 homes will be a huge battle, but taking a cue from our long term residents, environmental groups, and ou	Email										x						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Please don't approve this development! It is way too big and is in a terrible location. It will destroy the beautiful view that every Valley resident welcomes on their return home to the SG Valley. Yes we need some affordable housing, but not on this parcel, and not at market rate. The Sir Francis Drake corridor in San Geronimo should remain rural. This huge development would create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village.	Email								х		х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Please don't support the development of 98 units on former Flanders Ranch land in the San Geronimo Valley. This site stands at the gateway to the SGV and the headwaters of the watershed which houses our endangered salmonids. It is an especially sensitive location, both aesthetically and ecologically, and should be protected from all development. Just a couple of years ago, you and the BOS attempted to do a very good thing for Marin County and the SGV by purchasing the golf course, in order to protect it permanently from development and to give endangered salmonid populations a place to recover. Probably, in a few years' time, some public entity—possibly Marin County—will resume the pursuit of these goals when TPL sells the land. If the County allows a new village of several hundred people to be built, with all the ecological disturbance that entails, just a short distance upstream from the salmonid sanctuary, it will jeopardize this important environmental restoration project. I believe the 98 units are envisioned to be targeted to buyers of "above moderate" income. If so, then this suggests that the homes will be too expensive to count as the sort of affordable housing that the voting public sympathizes with. We don't want a SGV that is even more exclusive (economically speaking) than it already is—especially not at the expense of the ecology, aesthetics, etc. Please do all you can to keep the old Flanders Ranch area completely open and agricultural. Thank you very much.	Email										х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Please understand that our history and values are not supportive of mass development in the San Geronimo Valley. We value our rural character for aesthetic reasons but equally for safety. We must protect egress for fire primarily. In addition we do not have the infrastructure and resources to support 98 new homes. This ideal would be better served along the 101 corridor. Thank you for consideration of supporting no development of the open fields adjacent to Flander's property.	Email		х						Х		х		Х				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL								_		1							
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Remove the high school site from any consideration for housing. It is not supported in our Community Plan (see excerpts below). In addition, this is the critical view shed that every Valley resident experiences and "welcomes" on their return "home" to the San Geronimo Valley as they negotiate the curve, going west, at the bottom of White's Hill leaving the eastern urbanized corridor (where over 90% of Marin residents live), behind. This priceless Valley view encompasses the entire Ottolini/Flanders ranch and the Spirit Rock Meditation Center property from the meadows on the flats, to the uplands and ridge that seems to disappear going west towards the Nicasio pass. High School Site Issues: The development currently proposed would create the equivalent of a "new" village and its location next to SF Drake Blvd. would destroy the Valley's rural character. Increased traffic would overwhelm Drake Blvd. in route to and from the eastern urbanized corridor and 101. The north east section of San Geronimo Creek, which is home to coho salmon and steelhead trout, appears to be in this area. If confirmed, protection of this area could impact proposed development. FYI - Historically, this 50 acre school site was originally owned by the Ottolin/Flanders Ranch family. It was condemned for use of a planned High School part of the '61 Master Plan calling for 20,000 residents and 5000 homes. This '61 Master Plan was scuttled in 1972/73 after the newly elected Board of Supervisors voted to adopt the new County Wide Plan. Subsequently, the BOS began the development of highly successful Community Plans for designated areas in West Marin. At one point, (the '80's I think) the Tamalpais school board considered selling it's 3 unused school sites. Two were in the eastern corridor and one was in the Valley. The board appointed a committee to study the situation and make a recommendation. It was composed of Kate Blickhahn (Drake High School Superintendent), Dale Elliott of Forest Knolls and me. They implemented our recommendation to se	Email				×				×		x						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	The proposed 98 new houses on the 50 acre parcel in the San Geronimo Valley was just brought to my attention. I am not opposed to more housing, but I am opposed to how and where they will be built i(n a cluster creating a new community as well as changing the landscape as you enter The Valley). There have been other projects in the past that are woven into the existing communities. The low cost neghborhood next to the Trailer park is a fine example. I am assuming that this Federal money is to be used for our lower income population? I have lived in the Valley for 50 years at which time we voted against sewer lines and natural gas in order to keep housing developments from taking place. Will a project this large take that into consideration? I will be sure to be adding my input as this project moves forward. Dennis, as old acquaintance I'm hoping that we can find time to discuss this more, I am no longer 'asleep at the wheel'Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration.	Email		х						х		х			х		х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is a terrible idea! I can tell you that it will become another problem like Victory Village. You can't just plunk down a totally different community (with different needs and mind-sets) inside another unique community. And what about water !??!?!?!! I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations	Email								х		х						ĺ
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This proposal make no sense for multiple valid reasons. Please do what you can to reject it.	Email								х								
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	While I support adding housing in WMarin, I believe the White Hill location is not appropriate for the reasons below: This clearly goes against our Community Plan. It is an area prone to flooding As a result of the above, it interferes with the watershed that provides the creeks that support the endangers steelhead. It will place untold stress on an already precarious road evacuation during wildfire season. the Valley is already under major stress with failing septics, with no help on the horizon as has been blocked by the Planning Group. The Valley and it's homeowners are about to be handcuffed by the new stream side ordinances, making repairs and maintenance near impossible, so the added burden of 68 homes is such a double standard. The rural character of the Valley will be visually destroyed. I am curious why this information has been held from the public and the very short window of public comment which further punctuates your desertion, the same way you mid-handled the Golf Course debacle. Please respond with a confirmation of my very strong objection to this location.	Email								x	x	x						
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	(Comment edited for length) Please find attached the San Geronimo Valley Planning Group's response to the proposed Housing Element update. Background: The San Geronimo Valley Planning Group was formed in 1972 to help elect Gary Giacomini to the Board of Supervisors in order to gain the critical third vote necessary to kill the 1981 Countywide Master Plan, which had envisioned 5,000 new homes and 20,000 additional residents for the San Geronimo Valley alone. While the plan was updated in 1982 and 1997, its central premise has never changed: preserving our Valley's rural character and protecting our natural environment. This commitment - along with that of many other community members - also helped permanenently preserve more than 2,300 acres of open space in our beloved Valley. We have been trying to apprehend the efforts of Marin County to meet the state- mandated "housing elements" through the rezoning of existing parcels. We are very concerned that few Valley residents are aware of the potential impact of this housing mandate on our community and that the Planning Group adamantly opposes the proposed, potential locations within our community identified below. High school property - We are alarmed by Candidate Housing Site P, the proposal to build 98 above-moderate-income units through rezoning the high school property next to the Ottolini/Flanders' Ranch at the bottom of White's Hill on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Our Community Plan clearly spells out that the use of this property should remain as agriculture or open space; the high school district agreed. Our reasons are numerous. 1. It would be a visual blight, destroying not only the aesthetics of the entrance to our Valley but also jamming suburbia into the inland rural corridor. 2. It would be a dangerous location, creating a separate enclave with an entrance of a very busy highway, and removing one of the few places where traffic can safely pass slower traffic. 3. Because this property is not within the boundaries of any of our four villages, it would destr				×	x	х			х		х					x	
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	1: can we use the Lagunitas school parcel that is before the Spirit Rock parcel? 2: If Spirit Rock is built on can it be hidden from road? 3: The visual view when you enter the Valley is gorgeous and should be maintained. 4: Lagunitas school campus has lots of unused space.	Email										х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1		1	1				1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I could not access the Balancing Site work area so I am submitting these comments here. SGV is am amazing place to be due to low development. I have had the benefit of living here 25 years. What is being proposed in both of the areas of the School property and at the Gold Course are for higher end homes. Higher end homes are not a help for our community. We need homes for families with kids, We need Senior housing. We don't need another 127 above moderate income homes. Have some vision. Create a place with a grocery store, deli, and place for people to meet. Create Senior housing. Have ability to share vehicles. This area could become a hub for our community to use and support. It is also a sensitive environmental area. It used to be where water would spread out when it rained and slowly sink into the ground providing water all year round for the fish. More concrete and asphalt = more runoff. This vision of 98 separate high end homes here is not fitting to the rural area of our valley. It is just going to bring in more people who want a rural lifestyle from other areas and NOT give our locals homes. Every day, people, and families are looking for homes. Renters are being pushed out. It is unaffordable to live here. Solve the problem we have now, housing for our locals. Not bring more people here. Also, the place being considered at 6900 Sir Francis Drake is a privately owned place. Owned by a family that owns quite a bit of property in the Valley as it is. I certainly hope public monies are not going to rehab this property.	Email								х		x					х	
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I just want to add my voice to ask you not to support the new San Geronimo housing being considered. The environmental and infrastructure impact will be horrible!	Email		х								х						
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Future Housing Sites in Marin County. I attended the local Housing meeting regarding Santa Venetia and Los Ranchitos on February 15th and live in the Santa Venetia area. Here are my comments from a Santa Venetia resident perspective: 1. The process, while advised by the Marin County Planning Department, is being run by a consulting agency that is not familiar with Marin County and the local areas & neighborhoods. 2. The number of assigned housing units to Santa Venetia, 422, ignores the following. Before housing site numbers are assigned and accepted, a "CEQA-lite" analysis should be performed to determine if the numbers and locations are practical from a CEQA perspective. We heard these concerns brushed off with the response that if any development is going to be done, a full CEQA would be completed before development could/would proceed. This would be an "after-the-fact" process, with the fact that the housing numbers and sites have already been assigned and accepted, and would be too late to be influential in the development process. a. There is only one practical vehicle road out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by three schools, the one at the JCC, the Marin School, and Venetia Valley school, and a large pre-school. Traffic in & out of Santa Venetia is also already heavily impacted by the JCC, the Civic Center traffic, the Marin Lagoon traffic, the Veterans Memorial traffic, the Marin Lagoon Housing and the commercial enterprises along McInnis Parkway. b. Some of the sites selected are in wetlands areas, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road. c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site. d. The total number of housing units assigned to Marin County, and not just to the unincorporated areas, does not take into account the water needs. And we, Marin County as serviced by MMWD, are in the middle of a water shor	Email				x				x				x	х			
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Here in Santa Venetia, we are living with water shortages, traffic congestion, and our community's evacuation route was named the most dangerous in Marin and yet huge additional numbers of housing are proposed for this flood prone neighborhood. That's insane! We are not fooled by claims that these new residents won't drive everywhere. They will. We already know that every person of driving age in our neighborhood not only drives but owns a car, or truck. They line our streets, further restricting access routes. There are sites where housing can happen like at Northgate Mall, but not in our overcrowded flood zone.	Email				х				x	х			x				
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	lam a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia eventually experiments of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural as well as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at sever risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received a \$525k grant to address the critical issue of flooding in t	Email		×		×				x	×	×	x	×	x			
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I am against the proposed units on North San Pedro Road. This proposed project is completely unsustainable and not researched for undesirable living situations. There are many factors that indicate this would not be a good site to build. Factors such as flood control, sea rising at a rate we can expect in the coming years, congestion, removal of a ball park and mostly there are no services to support this project. Well thought out projects include parks, services, bike paths, sidewalks and a reasonable egress in case of fire. North San Pedro Road is all ready congested due to a large school and many churches on this road. Another road to San Rafael is available to Point San Pedro Road however this road is falling due to floods in the winter and very evident sink holes that are not being addressed. More traffic would of course erode the roads further and in the past have had slides on this road particularly after recent tree removal has increased the likely occurance.	Email		x	x	х				х	х	х		х				

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I attended the zoom meeting a few nights ago. I share the concern of some of my neighbors, well articulated by Gina Hagen. While I totally support affordable housing (so question if this will be "affordable" for working class people), I think we already have too many high density buildings on San Pedro Road, Joc, school, rest homes, elder affordable housing, civic center etc So I would support maybe 25 more units or something manageable, but hundreds seems like asking for trouble in an emergency. I live on Labrea way and I am glad we have housing for families, down the street, but a common problem is the amount of cars and high occupancy of some of the apartments. The overflow of cars goes all the way to Rosal, and currently I have had cars parked in front of my house for a month and more. It is not a significant problem in my case, but my neighbor who has teenagers with cars, is having to struggle to park their own cars, while the overflow is from housing two blocks away. Obviously San Rafael is a good place for more housing and i would think a place closer to the freeway like Marin Square could be used for extra units of housing. I also would personally like to build an accessory unit in my front yard for a student, teacher, medical professional, at affordable rate. It would be nice to have a department in Marin county who could help seniors like myself design, get permits, and loans to afford to create such units. I myself was a renter in Marin for 36 years and lived in in-law apartments. I found it much more private and a win/win solution for the owner, typically older retired person, and myself as young professional. I was excited about an organization called Lily Pads and attended a meeting but found out later the owner was no longer providing services. So this would be a great thing to promote. Thank you for including us in your work. Hope we can have more affordable housing, while preserving the safety of our neighborhoods.	Email					x			x							x	
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I served on the Santa Venetia Community Plan (SVCP) Committee for almost 10 years, including working with County Staff the last 4 years, until its final adoption in 2017. This process included a thorough survey of our neighbors who commented on every empty parcel and open space for future development (and in fact Godbe told us the response was overwhelming with a higher than normal percentage of participation). Our SVCP Committee Members represented every comer of Santa Venetia. We held community meetings (that were well-attended) so all residents had a chance to voice their opinions and ideas. No one knows Santa Venetia better than Santa Venetians. The plan was supposed to cover everything of interest to ensure a diverse, family-oriented, and happy community for years to come. Adding 442 units is simply untenable for a small, working-class hamlet such as Santa Venetia. The last two open spaces (two ball fields) are slated for high density housing. This is totally uncharacteristic of the surrounding neighbors who live in small, single-family housing. In the February 15th Housing Element Zoom call, with County Staff and Contractors from who knows where?, we were informed that our Community Plan would need to be updated. Who would do this work? When and how soon would these updates happen? How can the County randomly update our Community Plans that we spent so many resources on. SB-9 and SB-10 are a complete contradiction to our Community Plan that we dedicated years of work and volunteer hours to finally see its adoption. These past summers, we've stayed inside due to smoke and/or triple-digit weather. We used a bucket from our shower to water our indoor and deck plants while our yard withered and died due to restrictions and requirements in place from Marin Water. We worked out evacuation routes to lader residents to becape danger due to our one road in and out of Santa Venetia. I heard chain saws, chippers, and weed whackers almost every day, regardless of the high, fire-danger days. This is due to San Rafa	Email									×			x	×			
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I will reiterate the comments I made at the February 15 Housing Element meeting I've lived in SV for over 30 years. I've served on the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association Board of Directors for almost 30 years. Through our neighborhood association, The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA), we try to get the word out so that our residents are aware of upcoming projects and opportunity to comment. We've heard from Santa Venetia residents that they want to protect our quality of life. We are already concerned about the constant fire danger, flooding, Sea Level Rise, ingress and egress, and unsafe evacuation routes. Climate change is a huge concern for us and as well, we have run out of water in Marin County and are under strict mandates, so I can't understand how adding more and more housing units will help. And to restate, 422 units in SV is an increase of almost 25% of the 1,700-1,800 units we currently had, at last count. It's a very shocking number of additional units for us. I grew up in San Rafael. I hate what they've done to the City and have been constantly disappointed with the building choices and what they have given up. I don't want to see that happening in Santa Venetia — more congestion and loss of our green spaces. Affordable housing sounds great on paper, but we never seem to get that promise fulfilled. I've followed projects in San Rafael and for almost every project, the promise is a huge amount of housing with a small portion designated affordable and then after the project passes through the hurdles, the affordable-housing number is adjusted always downward. I remember previously rules were passed to keep up with the demand of affordable housing, but the goalposts seem to constantly change and that number is lowered. What is the promise that won't happen with this process? Also, I heard them say at that meeting, they were giving schools and churches more flexibility by allowing them to build on parking lots? If that is the case, where will people park? They've already lowered	Email								x	×	x		x	×		x	

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Re: Marin County Housing and Safety Elements Update, 2023 – 2031. The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA) is an organization representing the interests of 1,700 – 1,800 households (4,474 residents per the 2019 census figures) who live in Santa Venetia. As an organization, we are dedicated to the enhancement and preservation of the character and quality of life of the Santa Venetia neighborhood. We do our best to represent our community and have an established reputation to be a voice for proper development. And in accordance with our mission statement, we, the Board Members of the SVNA, feel compelled to comment on this issue. We want to ensure that the Marin County Board of Supervisors receives an accurate impression from our community regarding the updated Housing Element and are writing today to summarize feedback we have heard from many of our members. Many residents of Santa Venetia, including members of the SVNA, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting where consultants representing the interests of the housing element initiative presented online tools for community feedback. We find these tools inadequate; rather nacerving an open platform for the BOS to receive realistic community input, they seem designed to provide information to housing element staff as to where to add more housing. The Housing Element recommends 422 additional units for Santa Venetia. There are currently fewer than 1,800 residences in Santa Venetia, so this represents an increase of approximately 25%— far more growth than the neighborhood has seen for at least two decades. This mandate seems utterly siloed from the worsening reality of global warming and climate change, (the existence of which was recognized both in the Countywide Plan and by the Marin County Civil Grand Jury) which is leading to catastrophic weather events such as fires and flooding. The upland parts of Santa Venetia and tirrectly threatened by flooding are part of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and are subject to year-round fire danger. Like all of Mar	Email				x				x	х			x	x		x	
R13 - 26600 State Route 1 (Tomales)	I would like to suggest an alternative site to the one listed on the east side of Hwy 1 and 1st Street in Tomales. After living in Tomales very close to 30 years, I feel the intersection there is already quite impacted due to school traffic approaching both elementary and high school, the district office traffic, our downtown businesses including bakery, deli, and general store and much weekend tourist traffic mistaking their way to Dillon Beach. I feel one or more of the sites at old high school, or further north of "hub" of town would be more suitable and would not add to the current congestion.	Email				х												
R15 -12785 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Inverness)	The proposed development and locations designated for housing in unincorporated West Marin is ill-conceived and inappropriate. This appears to be a numbers game on the part of the County and outside, contracted MIG development agency. The plan lacks consideration for or understanding of natural resources, environmental hazards and the existing community. Communities around Tomales Bay are watershed areas with drainage into the vulnerable bay, creeks and streams, the salt marshes and wildlife habitats. The site near Vladimir's restaurant, across from Dixon Marine, is directly across from Tomales Bay and almost at sea level. This area and the road can flood during a high tide or heavy rain, draining pollution into the bay. Also the proposed building would affect the small downtown of Inverness. West Marin is served by narrow, curving, two lane access roads. For Inverness there is only one road, in or out, a problem during flooding, fires, landslides and general overcrowding on weekends and holidays. These roads frequently need repair when lanes crumble into a creek, hillside or the bay. No freeways please, as was proposed in the 60s. I have lived in Inverness since the 70s. As a single working mother, a teacher, I raised my daughter in Inverness. Over the years I have seen families and friends move away as rentals, cottages and small units were converted to more lucrative Airbnbs and second homes. There are 4 houses around me with 2 units in each. Two are completely unoccupied. Two are rarely used by their absentee owners, leaving each second unit vacant. There are many houses like this in Inverness and far too many BnBs and other short term rentals. An absentee owner might purchase a house, spend an exorbitant amount of money improving it for short term rental or investment. Possible housing is currently available. West Marin already has serious problems related to climate change, as well as overcrowding, road congestion air and noise pollution from cars, sewage and, most obviously, water. Inverness is served by	Email				x					×	×		×	x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1				1	1 -		1		,				-		-	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	×		
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EliR and the 2012 Housing Element SelIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodpalin, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	х	x	x	x		×		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1			,													
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) The Tam Design Review Board is charged with focusing on and supporting the provisions of the Tamalpais Area Community Plan (TACP). In addition to laying out a description of the appropriate character of the community, this plan clearly sets forth constraints specifying that environmental hazards must be taken into account in the site selection process. Indeed, this is also crucial for the viability of the adoption of the Housing Element itself. According to step #7 of the Housing Element's Site Identification Process: "Provide in the analysis a general description of any known environmental or other features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected weltands, oak tree preserves, very high fire hazard severity zones) that have the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites" p. 10. The TACP "places a strong emphasis on protecting the public safety and preserving the natural resources of the community, while still permitting individual property owners to realize reasonable development potentials" (pg. 1-3). This balance is more critical today than it was in 1992 when the plan was written, with the risk of chronic flooding, impending sea level rise, and fire in the wildland-urban interface presenting an ever-greater peril to our neighborhoods. Tam Valley, Almonte, Homestead Valley, and Muir Woods Park are already viable and diverse neighborhoods, containing a range of housing from high-end single family residences to affordable apartments. Maintaining this diversity has long been a goal of the community, as expressed in Section I-C of the TACP. Added mixed use development in the Tam Junction area could, with proper planning and infrastructure update, provide needed housing which would have a minimal negative impact and enhance the community. The Housing Element should take a closer look at the potential for rezoning to achieve its goals. For those of lesser week and enhances the community. The Housing blement should take a closer look at the potential for re	Email (See Email Comments Received PDF, pp. 228-231)				x					x	x		×			x	
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. Given the County's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patherns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6 Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units any particular to even the foreign properties (which drives up housing costs) and land banking (which is performed to dri	Email				x					x	х		x			x	
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	х	х	х	х		х		х	х	х	х	х	х	х		

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, as assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingod. He site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than p	Email				x		x			x							
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				х					х			х				
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodríguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)-that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				x					X	x						
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would ensure and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways.: II. Ali Cyality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please follow the below link to read the comment letter by Technical Expert Matt Hagemann. VI. Endangered Special Status Species. VII. Insufficient Services & Public Tran	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	×	x		X		×	×	x	x	х	х	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R19 - Tennessee Valley Ro: (Tamalpais)	information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please follow the below link to read the comment letter by Technical Expert Matt Hagemann. VI. Endangered Special Status Species. VII. Insufficient Services & Public Transit. VIII. Historic Wetlands and Baylands Corridor. IX. Historic Marshland That Could Be Restored. 160 Shoreline Huy and 260 Redwood Hwy Frontage Rd. are historic marshland. X. High Density Development Is Not Consistent With the Traditional Character Of The Local Semi-Rural Communities. Conclusion: The County now has sufficient information to understand that the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Sites are inappropriate for inclusion in the 2023-2031 Housing Element Candidate Housing Sites Inventory. Not only would construction of housing on these sites exacerbate the already existing problems but doing so when the County admits in the Marin Countywide Plan EIR and 2012 Housing Element's FSEIR that significant adverse unavoidable impacts would result from such construction defies logic. Moreover, there can be no benefit that would override the impacts of environmental harm and severe illness, injury or loss of life from building on the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites, which are laden with environmental constraints and dangerous hazards. The best course of action would be for the County to revise the list to reflect the current problems with traffic, seismic activity, hazardous soil conditions, air and noise pollution, water supply, flooding, and impending sea level rise and to find that no new residential development in the Tam Junction & Manzanita areas is appropriate. Such action would be consistent with the Board of Supervisors' sensible decisions.	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		×		x	x	x	x	x	x	X		
R19 - Tennessee Valley Ro: (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) The Tam Design Review Board is charged with focusing on an supporting the provisions of the Tamalpais Area Community Plan (TACP). In addition to laying out a description of the appropriate character of the community, this plan clearly sets forth constraints specifying that environmental hazards must be taken into account in the site selection process. Indeed, this is also crucial for the viability of the adoption of the Housing Element's Site Identification Process: "Provide in the analysis a general description of any known environmental or other features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected wetlands, oak tree preserves, very high fre hazard severity zones) that have the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites" p. 10. The TACP "places a strong emphasis on protecting the public safety and preserving the natural resources of the community, while still permitting individual property owners to realize reasonable development potentials" (pg. I-3). This balance is more critical today than it was in 1992 when the plan was written, with the risk of chronic flooding, impending sea level rise, and fire in the wildland-urban interface presenting an ever- greater peril to our neighborhoods. Tam Valley, Almonte, Homestead Valley, and Muir Woods Park are already viable and diverse neighborhoods, containing a range of housing from high-end single family residences to affordous partments. Maintaining this diversity has long been a goal of the community, as expressed in Section I-C of the TACP. Added mixed use development in the Tam Junction area could, with proper planning and infrastructure update, provide needed housing which would have a minimal negative impact and enhance the community. The Housing Element should take a closer look at the potential for rezoning to achieve its goals. For those of lesser wealth to have access to the amentiles available in the Tam Area, in particular good schools and proximity to jobs and open space, is a noble and important g	Email (See Email Comments Received PDF, pp. 228-231)				x					x	x		×			x	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL				1				1	, ,	,	-		-	- 1			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. (it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of housing of up to 4 units. This will stop speculative over-bidding of	Email				x					X	x		x			x	
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	x	х	х	×		х		x	x	x	x	x	х	x		
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)		Email				х					х			Х				
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodriguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)that are different or additionalthat would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				x					х	x						
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	I am writing to request that Strawberry site R2 be removed from potential sites for high density housing. This site is not appropriate for high density housing. The Eagle Rock neighborhood already has traffic problems, and adding units will exacerbate those issues. This particular site is in an inaccessible extreme stope. Adding high density housing to this site will also destroy the family neighborhood surrounded by open space. Please consider repurposing more urban locations instead of paying over natural landscape.	Email				х						x						
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	I live on Eagle Rock Rd. It is already congested. Traffic conditions on Tiburon Blvd at most times make it difficult to enter the Eagle Rock area. At the proposed location there is a 4 way intersection, providing access to a gas station, a multi tenant commercial building, access to N. Knoll with section 8 housing (which is very busy) and the residents and providers to my neighbors and me. The proposed site is on a steep hillside making it difficult to build. There is a bus stop at the base where N. Knoll empties onto Tiburon Blvd. This may be good for your concerns, but every day there are cars parked on lower Eagle Rock Rd. using free parking to access the bus service, many use it for longer term parking when traveling out of the area. Building more units on your proposed site will increase street parking. It always does. Your proposal will increase foot traffic crossing 4 lane Tiburon Blvd. We see pedestrians, daily, risking their lives crossing to go to Strawberry Shopping Center. Sure, there is a pedestrian crossing lane, but with the traffic they are not always visible to drivers. It's a scary operation trying to cross. The traffic entering onto Tiburon Blvd. from Hwy 101 is already congested. Then add the traffic coming up from Strawberry Shopping Center. Certain times of the day you already have to wait for more than one light to get through. It seems that California fire seasons are getting longer and more intense. We could have a real discussion on that, but that is the reality today. We are located down hill from large open spaces. Our evacuation points are in Strawberry and with massive traffic also evacuating from points toward Tiburon, it could be a real disaster. Development on this plot is not a good idea.	Email				x	х		х			х		х				
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	Please start paying attention to the organizing activities of NIMBY — Marin Against Density an anti-housing group because they are already fighting future development47 N Knoll Road where Kruger Pines Retirement home in Strawberry is located is about in the middle of this NOT COUNTY MAINTAINED Road. The part closest to where Eagle Roc and Bay Vista is in the 20s and the part closest to 70 N Knoll Road where the vacant lot is, is at the other side and Kruger Pines is in the middle. If this gets the green light for development then trucks for construction will be really destroying the road and it will take several years to get things completed too so please work on getting this road designation changed into county maintained road as part of the approval of the land development and have the whole road redone /paved when the development is completed I would love to see another senior/disabled housing development be built on this land along with workforce housing for teachers and first responders too. It would be wonderful to have this parcel developed to house more seniors born 1946-1964 and to have N Knoll Road become MAINTAINED as a county maintained road too because of all the potholes that are in the road now. I would like to submit this email letter to show my support for 70 N Knoll Road to be developed into affordable housing in the extremely low income, very low income, range of seniors 62+ who are falling into homelessness all the time now with greater frequency due to how low their social security is compared to what the rental rates are in Marin County. The teachers and first responders need housing too so please build housing for them also. 70 N Knoll Rd, Mill Valley, CA 94941   Zillow: The vacant lot last sold on 2016-10-18 for \$11,60000, with a recorded lot size of 6.12 acres	Email															x	х

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	So evidently this vacant lot is being considered for building housing and NIMBY is already out against it! Please start paying attention to the organizing activities of NIMBY – Marin Against Density an anti-housing group because they are already fighting future development. 47 N Knoll Road where Kruger Pines Retirement home in Strawberry is located is about in the middle of this NOT COUNTY MAINTAINED Road. The part closest to where Eagle Roc and Bay Vista is in the 20s and the part closest to 70 N Knoll Road where the vacant lot is, is at the other side and Kruger Pines is in the middle. If this gets the green light for development then trucks for construction will be really destroying the road and it will take several years to get things completed too so please work on getting this road designation changed into county maintained road as part of the approval of the land development and have the whole road redone /paved when the development is completed. I would love to see another senior/disabled housing development be built on this land along with workforce housing for teachers and first responders too. It would be wonderful to have this parcel developed to house more seniors born 1946-1964 and to have N Knoll Road become MAINTAINED as a country maintained road to because of all the potholes that are in the road now. I would like to submit this email letter to show my support for 70 N Knoll Road to be developed into affordable housing in the extremely low income, very low income, range of seniors 62+ who are falling into homelessness all the time now with greater frequency due to how low their social security is compared to what the rental rates are in Marin County. The teachers and first responders need housing to so please build housing for them also. 70 N Knoll Rod, Mill Valley, CA 94941   Zillow: The vacant lot last sold on 2016-10-18 for \$11,60000, with a recorded lot size of 6.12 acres	Email															х	х
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways.: II. N. ir Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please follow the below link to read the comment letter by Technical Expert Matt Hagemann. VI. Endangered Special Status Species. VII. Insufficient Services & Public Tra	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		x		x	х	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SelR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		X	x	x	x		X		x	x	x	x	x	х	x		
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	[Comment edited for length) The Tam Design Review Board is charged with focusing on and supporting the provisions of the Tamalpais Area Community (TACP). In addition to laying out a description of the appropriate character of the community, this plan clearly sets forth constraints specifying that environmental hazards must be taken into account in the site selection process. Indeed, this is also crucial for the viability of the adoption of the Housing Element itself. According to step #7 of the Housing Element's Site Identification Process: "Provide in the analysis a general description of any known environmental or other features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected wetlands, oak tree preserves, very high fire hazard severity zones) that have the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites" p. 10. The TACP "places a strong emphasis on protecting the public safety and preserving the natural resources of the community, while still permitting individual property owners to realize reasonable development potentials" (pg. 1-3). This balance is more critical today than it was in 1992 when the plan was written, with the risk of chronic flooding, impending sea level rise, and fire in the wildland-urban interface presenting an ever- greater peril to our neighborhoods. Tam Valley, Almonte, Homestead Valley, and Muir Woods Park are already viable and diverse neighborhoods, containing a range of housing from high-end single family residences to affordable apartments. Maintaining this diversity has long been a goal of the community, as expressed in Section I-C of the TACP. Added mixed use development in the Tam Junction area could, with proper planning and infrastructure update, provide needed housing which would have a minimal negative impact and enhance the community. The Housing Element should take a closer look at the potential for rezoning to achieve its goals. For those of lesser wealth to have access to the amenties available in the Tam Area, in particular good schools and proximity	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 228-231)				x					x	x		x			x	
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				Х					х			х				
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					Х			х				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. (if when the Country's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the properties to have short-term rentals income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative Investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of housing of up to 4 units. This will stop speculative vore-bid	Email				x					×	х		x			x	
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risks of flooding from storm surges or see level rise. 3. Be this Marsh: Require all fores to development algreene the Bothsh Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the mersh. 3. Be this Marsh: Require all fores to development algreene the Bothsh Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that the design of the traffic patterns to ensure the atary new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an revacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worse traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worse traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure the any new housing development in that are a will not worse traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure the any new housing development in that are awill not worse traffic patterns to ensure the safety and new traffic patterns to ensure the safety and new traffic patterns to ensure the safety and traffic patterns to ensure the safety and the safety and traffic patterns to ensure that the language traffic patt	Email				x					х	x		x			x	
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	×	x	x	х		х		×	х	x	×	Х	×	х		
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	The information lists only 1 Parcel, which is wrong - there are 3. It lists only 36 possible Housing units, which is wrong - it should be 36 units for Workforce or Senior units and 73 Hotel rooms, which is what the Tam Valley community Plan calls for on the larger Parcel. This site is located in the Manzanita area, not Almonte.	Email	х														х	

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		x	x	x	x		x		x	х	х	х	x	x	x		
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "Fo of Local Roadways: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadvays. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential haelth im		x	х	х	x		x		x	x	x	x	X	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		, ,							1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	such emergencies. Softenine riginway in 1 and valley is where most or in the propose nousing sites to our area area to a complete standstill and result in property damage and human fatalities. We further note that steadily increasing traffic impacts on Shoreline Highway from tourism continue to aggravate all these challenging conditions. While we appliand the careful consideration of available sites by MIG, as community volunteers appointed to research and uphold the values of the Tam Plan, we cannot in good conscience support the choice of the sites within our area without: 1) A detailed study of future traffic and its impacts on evacuation through Tam Junction and the Highway 101 on-ramp; 2) A careful analysis of the impact of new, medium or high-density housing on the Bothin Marsh and the risks of chronic flooding; 3) Development of a plan for Highway 1 at Manzanita and along Shoreline Highway to accommodate imminent sea level rise; and 4) Assurances that, if there is no way to avoid selecting housing sites in the Tam Plan area for development, the resulting housing will be protected from speculative investors and the potential to remove these future developments from the long-term rental market. The Tamalpais Area is so vulnerable to climate change disasters that, frankly, unless the housing built has a direct impact on resolving the housing crisis and addressing those most in need, new development will only intensify the crises of both climate risks and affordability. We understand the mandates from the State require you to make some challenging choices in selecting housing sites. In addition to placing questions of safety and environmental stewardship at the top of your agenda, we would like to suggest that you include in the current update of the Countywide Plan some further policies that will help guide County planning in the face of both State mandates and, if and when these mandates are modified, the undesirable results that might emerge. Please see the attached detailed list of policies	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 228-231)				x					×	×		x			×	
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT	Email	х	Х	x	x		х		х	×	×	x	Х	×	Х		
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingo Rd. he site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than pr	Email				x		×			×							
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				Х					Х			Х				
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodriguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)—that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				х					x	x						
R3 - 275 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	I wanted to share concerns about a proposed housing element on the corner of Olive avenue and Atherton (275 Olive Ave, currently a nursery). That site is a wet meadow and not an appropriate building location for a development of 50 homes. It is already subject to frequent flooding, is essentially sitting on top of a wetland nature preserve, and is basically at sea level. If you walk out there today, it is mostly under water. The inevitable sea level rise that will impact that spot makes it, and any other sites at that elevation, inappropriate for further development. Is it alright to ask why this parcel is being considered when these conditions are well known?	Email	x							х	Х	Х						
R3 - 275 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	The consideration of this site (275 Olive Avenue) raises a concern that other similarly inappropriate sites may also be up for consideration in other parts of Marin. Would it be possible to get a list of any sites that are within 500 feet of a wetland? I studied wetland habitat restoration planning in graduate school, and was under the impression that CEOA/CWA sect 404 prevented projects from being built on top of or close to wetlands.	Email										х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1			1					_			-	-				
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R5 - 299 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	I am just finding out about the rezoning proposal along the Atherton corridor in Novato, and since I missed the meeting, I am writing to express my deepest concern as well as how much I am against this proposal. I live at the end of Olive Avenue, close to Atherton Ave, and have for almost 40 years. I have watched the impact just a few additional homes have had in this area. I am tremendously concerned about the wildlife, and how this proposal would jeopardize their well being. It would greatly impact their ability to access food and water. More homes means more traffic, which means more animals in danger of being struck by cars. There is already too much traffic for this corridor, and I am referring to Olive Avenue as well as Atherton Avenue. These areas cannot handle more housing! Please reconsider this proposal and keep the wildlife and our open spaces preserved.	Email				х				х		х						
R5 - 299 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	I am writing to express my opinion on the potential construction of hundreds of new housing units along the Atherton Avenue corridor to meet the county's state-mandated housing quotas. I urge you to redirect new high-density housing to more appropriate areas with better access and infrastructure and with less adverse impacts on wildlife and existing residents: It is not sensible to add large new sources of traffic congestion directly onto Atherton Avenue, the only conduit for evacuation from surrounding neighborhoods during fire emergencies. The proposed development will impact a rich and diverse wildlife population in the area, beyond just the destruction of habitat in the footprints of new construction. Increases in road traffic, noise, and other human activity will invariably take a toll. Foxes, opossums, and raccoons regularly transit my yard at night (I live off of Atherton Ave) and the semi-rural neighborhood environment also supports deer, wild turkeys, hawks, quail, squirrels, owls, turkey vultures and other animals. These populations are assets to the natural environment of Marin County and are all sensitive to human encroachment. The potential housing development is grossly uncharacteristic of the adjacent neighborhoods in terms of density and appearance. The proposed housing locations do not have walk-to shopping and other services, which I believe should be a top priority for siting new high-density housing. The Atherton corridor is a narrow strip with very limited road access: One way in from the west; one way in from the east, and one secondary access (Olive Ave) from the south. This situation is a natural consequence of the geographic boundaries along the corridor. Loading up this narrow space with more traffic, more parking needs, more water requirements, and more sewer infrastructure – when other options exist – does not make sense.	Email		×	×	x				х		X		x	x			
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	I live on Eagle Rock Rd. It is already congested. Traffic conditions on Tiburon Blvd at most times make it difficult to enter the Eagle Rock area. At the proposed location there is a 4 way intersection, providing access to a gas station, a multi tenant commercial building, access to N. Knoll with section 8 housing (which is very busy) and the residents and providers to my neighbors and me. The proposed site is on a steep hillside making it difficult to build. There is a bus stop at the base where N. Knoll empties onto Tiburon Blvd. This may be good for your concerns, but every day there are cars parked on lower Eagle Rock Rd. using free parking to access the bus service, many use it for longer term parking when traveling out of the area. Building more units on your proposed site will increase street parking. It always does. Your proposal will increase foot traffic crossing 4 lane Tiburon Blvd. We see pedestrians, daily, risking their lives crossing to go to Strawberry Shopping Center. Sure, there is a pedestrian crossing lane, but with the traffic they are not always visible to drivers. It's a scary operation trying to cross. The traffic entering onto Tiburon Blvd. from Hwy 101 is already congested. Then add the traffic coming up from Strawberry Shopping Center. Certain times of the day you already have to wait for more than one light to get through. It seems that California fire seasons are getting longer and more intense. We could have a real discussion on that, but that is the reality today. We are lessens that California fire seasons cour evacuation points are in Strawberry and with massive traffic also evacuating from points toward Tiburon, it could be a real disaster. Development on this plot is not a good idea.	Email				x	x		х			х		х				
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
R7 - Eagle Rock Road f (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. We are already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsdes are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
San Geronimo	(Comment edited for length)l attended the Wednesday evening presentation last week dealing with the State mandate for increasing housing in Marin. Clearly, you have been given a difficult task. Your introduction of the Guiding Principles and "explore strategies" was well done and appreciated. You answered most questions very well. Regretfully, time constraints didn't allow for in-depth responses and discussion. In every case, yours was the final comment and you, of necessity, moved on I also wish there had been more time for comments. It was kind of you to stay later. That was appreciated and beneficial but some of us couldn't stay because we had another meeting to attend following your scheduled presentation. I have lived in the San Geronimo Valley (Lagunitas) for 60+ years. I was one of the leaders in the five year effort (1972 -77) to create a Community Plan that would preserve the Valley's rural character and natural resources and continue to be active. I was disappointed that so few homeowners from the Valley attended your presentation. Despite the country's efforts, I'm convinced that many Valley residents simply don't know about the current Plan and would be shocked to learn about it and its impact. We can rectify this problem. I request that you hold a meeting at the Lagunitas School multi-purpose room and make a presentation, with maps, and get one on one feedback from San Geronimo Valley residents and groups regarding recommendations and alternative. In addition: I support the need for affordable housing in the San Geronimo Valley particularly for those with less than a moderate income. I support community involvement studying the issue of what, where, why and how (with the Community Plan as our guide) to deal with affordable housing in our valley, before providing any sites listing. Presbyterian Church - I cannot support the numbers proposed until I learn how much and where their property is located. Leelee and Staff: - The SGV Community Plan (CP) was developed by the Valley community over a fi	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 45-47)			x							x					x	
	Considering putting any housing on the site of the once San Geronimo golf course is wrong. It's too far out, creating more congestion on an already congested	Email	1		1	Х	1	ĺ	1	1	1			Х				1

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Tam Valley / Almonte: Unknown-049-231-09-Marin Drive (3 Units)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways: .II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	X		x		x	x	x	x	х	x	X		
Tam Valley / Almonte: Unknown-052-041-27- Shoreline Highway (12 Units)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's Elfa and the 2012 Housing Element Selfa demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodpain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	X	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	х	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1			1	1			1		,		-		-	-		—
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Unknown-049-231-09-M: Drive (3 Units) (Tam Valle Almonte)		Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	х	x	x	х		x		x	x	x	x	X	X	X		
Unknown-052-041-27- Shoreline Highway (12 Ui (Tam Valley / Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i		x	x	x	x		×		x	×	×	x	х	х	X		
West Marin Coastal Area	The deadline for input is unrealistic and the tool is exceedingly difficult to use. I understand the County is under pressure to meet the State mandate, however this plan is like throwing darts at a map. It fails to address critical disaster planning in advance of determining even potential site selection. Responding to the coastal zone: I find it extremely distressing that with the impact of climate related severe fire risk, drought, resource depletion, traffic, parking, lack of sewer, emergency ingress/egress, etc., that we are considering adding increased density. The tool does not allow for pinpointing houses that sit empty, or the 600 plus vacation rentals in West Marin. I support accessibility to community based housing. If there were a severe limit placed on vacation rentals in the Coast Region, clawing back on permits/allowances, a number of livable units equal to the numbers proposed would be freed up. I have lived here for 40 plus years and have seen housing go the way of increased tourism, housing stock becoming vacation/business stock and 2nd home owners with frequently vacant homes. Until the Coastal Commission understands the risks involved to increased density and supports strict limitations to vacation units/business, the problem will persist no matter how many new units are introduced. It is unfortunate that will likely take a fire storm / evacuation disaster to illustrate the hazards compounded by sheer numbers. My cottage on the Inverness Ridge burned in 95 and the risk then was a fraction of what it is today. Driving Sir Francis Drake on a usual busy weekend, or most days during the summer, is the equivalent of coastal gridlock. Adding more units at the bottom of White's Hill, Nicasio, Point Reyes, Olema, and Inverness is placing more people in vulnerable locations. Imagine residents trying, along with thousands of visitors, to flee during an inevitable disaster on a narrow artery. Stop vacation rentals; create incentives to convert empty living units to housing stock.	Email		×		x	×			×		x		х	x		х	
West Marin Coastal Area	The housing candidate sites for our Marin coastal villages are not suitable as these sites do not have jobs, public transit or community services please consider what doubling the population of these villages would mean to public safety when electricity is out our wells cannot pump water and the many propane tanks result in a hazardous mixture. Our aquifers are undoubtedly low after these droughts it will be a strain on our coastal communities to entertain a larger population many in our village are already renting their small units let's just let SB 9 do its job.	Email		х	х			x		х		х		х	х			

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
West Marin Coastal Area	The proposed development and locations designated for housing in unincorporated West Marin is ill-conceived and inappropriate. This appears to be a numbers game on the part of the County and outside, contracted MIG development agency. The plan lacks consideration for or understanding of natural resources, environmental hazards and the existing community. Communities around Tomales Bay are watershed areas with drainage into the vulnerable bay, creeks and streams, the salt marshes and wildlife habitats. The proposed Cottages building site is an environmental hazard to an already contaminated salt marsh and channel leading to Chicken Ranch Beach, Tomales Bay. As a result of previous inappropriate building and filling in a salt marsh, this has been an ongoing problem for many years. The site near Valdmint's restaurant, across from Dixon firm, e, is directly across from Tomales Bay and almost at sea level. This area and the road can flood during a high tide or heavy rain, draining pollution into the bay. Also the proposed building would affect the small downtown of Inverness. West Marin is served by narrow, curving, two lane access roads. For Inverness there is only one road, in or out, a problem during flooding, fires, landslides and general overcrowding on weekends and holidays. These roads frequently need repair when lanes crumble into a creek, hilliside or the bay. No freeways please, as was proposed in the 60s. I have lived in Inverness since the 70s. As a single working mother, a teacher, I raised my daughter in Inverness. Over the years I have seen families and friends move away as rentals, cottages and small units were converted to more lucrative Airbnbs and second homes. There are 4 houses around me with 2 units in each. Two are completely unoccupied. Two are rarely used by their absentee owners, leaving each second unit vacant. There are many houses like this in Inverness and far too many BnBs and other short term rentals. An absentee owner might purchase a house, spend an exorbitant amount of money improv	Email				x					×	×		×	×			
Woodacre	There is a lot for sale as you enter Woodacre at the intersection of Park and Railroad (and an adjacent lot that is not for sale) that would be ideal for seniors with close access to post office and grocery store and bus stop.	Email															х	Х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING									1							T = = = 7	
Location	Comment	Scenario	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR		HLT	EQT	GDL
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	Fire risk and lack of water.	Countywide												Х	Χ	<u> </u>		
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	The traffic on the streets between this parcel and the freeway are a congested mess already. Building in this fire zone will make inflow and outflow as well as access to emergency services so highly compacted that it will result in tragedy.	Countywide				х								Х				
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	This allows people to stay in Marin County whereas they are moving into Sonoma County now so I prefer this site to keep families living in Marin — but the road needs to be widened to absorb the extra traffic and people pulling out to make left and right turns, etc. This needs nice frontage roads too for slower traffic to be able to get out onto the 101 and off safely.	Countywide																х
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	Near Novato schools and infrastructure. Near freeway.	Infill																Х
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	Another horrendous place for such a massive building. Seal level rise, Manzanita already floods almost monthly - way too much traffic on hwy 1. Stinson, muir woods, Mt. Tam and muir beach get millions of visitors. Need to build a highway to serve all that traffic, completely redesing Tam junction. And many of MV residents go through the area. Bad, bad, bad place to ram housing in.	Countywide				х					х							
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	As long as this area is raised so that the units are not subject to flooding and same with their cars parking and housing need to be built above king tides and flood levels and then that would be fine.	Countywide									Х					<u> </u>		X
B - 160 Shoreline Highway B - 160 Shoreline Highway	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.  Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Countywide Enviro Hazard	1								Х						$\longmapsto$	X
C - 935 Sir Francis Drake	workforce housing, college student housing, family housing as long as there is parking for all their cars. Parking is key		<del>                                     </del>	<b>-</b>			<b>†</b>				_^					$\overline{}$	${ ightarrow}$	
Boulevard (Kentfield)  D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los	to the success of this as they need their cars to get to work and take younger kids to their schools too.  Closer to the city (than Novato) so a little less commute time. Close to bus lines. Wish it was closer to more amenities	Countywide														<u> </u>	Х	Х
Ranchitos)	though there are a few grocery stores/markets nearby.	Countywide			Х											<u> </u>		Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Higher density as close to Hwy 101 makes the most sense.	Countywide														<u> </u>		Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Is any thought given to the planning for family needs,heritage trees, drainage and creeks, earthquake and slides.? What about quality of life?Reduce the numbers and come up with healthful considerations	Countywide		Х	Х					Х		Х				<u></u>		
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	There is no spare land in this neighborhood. All parcels are occupied. Streets don't have sidewalks and are narrow. Already hard to get out if there was a fire. And it is on open space. We don't have enough water for more residents at these sites. Not a good candidate for this plan.	Countywide							х	х		х		х	Х			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	This area could handle 4 plex apartment units and this would be good for families, workforce, seniors too.	Countywide														<u> </u>		Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Why can't I adjust the number of units at this site?	Countywide																
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	Building in the southeast section of this parcel on the open fields would likely upset a lot of people in the neighborhood. The area is essentially a public park and the paths around the fields are are heavily trafficked by walkers and families. I think people would be more supportive of filling in areas in the southwest and north of the property, or replacing existing buildings/facilities with housing.	Countywide								х		х						х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	No public transit (one road in and out) and fire risk.	Countywide						Х						Х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This area is now Lucas Valley Park and has been since the late 1990s. Inappropriate.	Countywide										Х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This is already pretty far out and it would be fine for both workforce and senior housing and the seniors need to have access to good public transportation options so they can get food, to the bank, to the doctor, etc.	Countywide																Х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	this website is not a reliable way to seek community feedback. It assumes that each participant is familiar with all the sites in Marin County in order to move the housing around. Specifically on Jeannette Prandi housing, my opinion would be to expand on the low income senior housing that is already there- 50 units would likely double the existing senior housing and be plenty for the heavily trafficked LUCAS VALLEY Road and surrounding community.	Countywide															х	х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	Unlike 55 Marinwood Avenue, the areas further West within this section of Lucas Valley would be a dangerous area for new housing. The narrow valley with strong Western Wind shares similarities with the town of Paradise and its fatal experience with Fire. The green space at Jeannette Prandi Way is the only fire break within a dense construction of highly inflammable houses (resembling the Boulder, CO, neighborhood that burned this winder). For this valley to takes its fair share of county-wide new housing, the most intelligent solution would be to redevelop 55 Marinwood.	Countywide												Х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	the road and size of land is really good for dense suburban homes	Enviro Hazard																Х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This area is already developed:Lucas ValleyPark. See Marin County Parks.	Enviro Hazard										Х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This area is now Lucas Valley Park.	Equity										Х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	There should be, no development at this site, It's now a park-Lucas Valley Park and has been since the late 1990s. It was developed such as part of the development of the 80-unit Rotary Valley Vilage development.	Infill										Х				1		
F - 190 A Donahue Street (Marin City)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide														1		Х
F - 190 A Donahue Street (Marin City)	Ideal location close to shopping and jobs.	Countywide														1		Х
	Placing additional units here wouldn't be in line with the "Address Racial Equity and Historic Patterns of Segregation" Scenario because there is already a majority of publis housing and low income units in Marin City	Equity															х	

G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I would like to see the housing that should have been built by Bridge Housing years ago for seniors and families finally get built—it will be a great addition to the neighborhood and is very much needed.	Countywide													Х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	The redevelopment is a good idea. The blighted area will benefit from redevelopment, and I hear from neighbors that they are welcoming this idea. In the case of a fire there is a close exit to Hwy 101. I reduced the number of houses, because even with 110 units this small community is already taking a large share of the country-wide burden for new housing, and other intelligent options are available.	Countywide													х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	this website is not a reliable way to seek community feedback. It assumes that each participant is familiar with all the sites in Marin County in order to move the housing around. Specifically on Marinwood Market housing, my opinion would be to develop this property as previously discussed many time before. I'm not sure on the details of how much housing this site can hold, but it has close freeway access and a market nearby and would be a good site for housing.	Countywide													х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	Housing that matches the homes in the neighborhood. The market must stay	Enviro Hazard													Х
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Senior Housing would have the least amount of impact on the traffic so this would be a nice size senior community and go along with Venetia Oaks which is there already. Food bank and Extra Food and Meals on Wheels already goes to Venetia Oaks and this is a nice area for Seniors to reside in.	Countywide													х
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Traffic already terrible. Close to open space. Hard to get out if there was a fire as only one road in and out. No water for more residents. Not a good candidate for this plan.	Countywide			Х						Х	Х	Х		
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I live in Santa Venetia and this is too many housing units for this area (North San Pedro and Vendola drive). There is already a parking problem and it is sometimes difficult to find parking in front of your own home. Also, there is traffic congestion in front of the school in the morning and afternoon. You also have to take into account that Terra Linda Northgate wants to build over 1000 units in a small area. I realize they are not part of unincorporated Marin but the quality of life will definitely decline in Santa Venetia and surrounding areas with all these additional units when you take into account the traffic and increase in population. Per the housing meeting last week it stated that Santa Venetia along with Marin City already have a high number of low income residents. Is the additional housing going to be above market housing or are you just going to continue to place all low income residents in Santa Venetia?	Enviro Hazard			x	x			x					×	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Should be avoided - is within 5 ft. sea level rise projection zone by 2100	Enviro Hazard								Х					
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I object to 251 N. San Pedro as a building site for housing. There is a school and ball field. The children and their families need the child center. The ball field is used by little league and other children playing. The neighborhood can't absorb more cars parking in it. We don't have enough parking for the people who live here or there guests. If housing need to be build in Santa Venetia why not 1565 Vendola? The old school has been vacant for years. The property is not being used at all.	Countywide		х		х									
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Senior housing would be the least amount of traffic congestion impact and they could take public transit to get to where they needed to go for bank, grocery, doctor, etc.	Countywide													Х
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Traffic is already terrible in this neighborhood. Bordered by open space. Fire risk is high and it's already hard to get out with only one road in. There is not enough water for more residents. Not a good candidate for this plan.	Countywide			х						х	Х	Х		
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	This site does not fit this criteria. Public transportation is limited. These units will bring 2-4 cars per unit with no ample parking which would impact NSP road and nearby neighborhoods. NSP road is only 2 lanes with many schools along the way. Adding more cars would not only add to an already congested road it would be dangerous for those walking and riding bikes	Equity			х	х	х	х							
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	This proposed site is on a baseball field that is used by many for recreational purposes. This is a much needed baseball field. Field use is hard to come by. This field is also home to a variety of wildlife. Generations of quail. Night heron, egrets, owls hawks and many other bird species. As well as frogs coyote raccoon opossum squirrel fox deer. This site is not suitable for such a large housing project. This would significantly impact our environment	Infill		x							x				
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	Excellent location to build more housing and could support some commercial as well.	Countywide													Х
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	For those who like the outdoor rural life seniors and workforce housing for West Marin Employees to have a place to live that is affordable, this would be very nice.	Countywide													Х
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	This is a tiny rural village with very few services available including fire, medical, etc. Development must be kept to a miniumum for safety concerns.	Countywide		Х							Х	Х			
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	Should occur on north/west side of Rt. 1 / SFD Blvd. to avoid sea level rise zones.	Enviro Hazard								Х					Х
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	This area is already developed. Drinking water concerns, septic concerns, fire safety and evacuation concerns. Sea level rise and climate change will exacerbate these issues at this site.	Infill							Х	Х		Х	Х		
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	Housing should only be added in the valley and low hillsides. Mid to upper hillsides and ridgelines should be open space. If the housing can be kept in the valley, it would be reasonable to increase to 36 total houses. Another consideration is that traffic on Butterfield is congested. If more housing is added, then traffic lights and pedestrian crossings with warning lights should be added.	Countywide			х						х				х
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	I would like to see MORE housing units here. This is the end of the line, at the end of Butterfield Road out in the country and it would be good or workforce housing and seniors as long as there was a bus line that went that far to take them to doctor appointments and shopping. It would be fine for schoolsfamilies also.	Countywide													Х
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	Near open space. High fire risk. Lack of water for additional residents. Traffic already terrible in and out of this area.	Countywide			Х						Х	Х	Х		
L - 26500 Main Street (Tomales)	Senior housing would do well here for those who want country rural living with access to transportation for getting food , to the bank, to the doctor maybe a medical clinic bus could make the rounds to these rural areas where seniors would be residing so they could get checked out and get prescriptions, check ups, shots, blood draw, etc.	Countywide													х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING		 		_	 	 		 	 	$\overline{}$		
L - 26500 Main Street (Tomales)	Tomales does not have enough water or jobs to add this many units.	Countywide		Х						Х			
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Along the 101 corridor; room for more than this number; included in Marin Housing Pan.	Countywide											Χ
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I would love to see this developed for families, seniors, workforce housing all kinds of housing built on this site as it is perfect and beautiful and much preferable to living further out Lucas Valley road.	Countywide										Х	Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel-between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Countywide										х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This seems like a more economically realistic area, good access to 101 and infrastructure	Countywide											Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	this website is not a reliable way to seek community feedback. It assumes that each participant is familiar with all the sites in Marin County in order to move the housing around. Some confusion at this site about 1800 vs 221 units- big difference. My opinion is that some development could happen at this site, but 1800 would be a huge burden to the traffic on the 101 in this area and could not be supported by the existing marinwood infrastucture	Countywide					х						х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Traffic is going to be a problem. Lack of water.	Countywide			Х					Х			
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	403 units is much less than the capacity at St Vincent's. This is an area that could absorb a mix of housing types, and is close to highway 101.	Enviro Hazard										Х	Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Should be placed on this parcel but above 5 ft rise zone.	Enviro Hazard						Х					Χ
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel—between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Enviro Hazard										х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel-between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Enviro Hazard										х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Marin Housing plan provides for this scale of development at St Vincent.	Equity											Χ
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel—between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Equity										х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	The St. Vincent's property is nearly 800 acres within the US 101 corridorclose to transportation and services, a prime location for housing. Much of the property is located at higher elevations, so not subject to sea level rise. The area with greatest potential for housing development is located west of Holy Rosary Chapel (between the Chapel and US 101), where existing terrain would shield it from view from US 101, thereby maintaining the visual corridor. This area could accommodate all levels and densities of housing as a planned development.	Equity										х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Why so many here?	Equity					х						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St Vincent and Siviera Ranch can accommodate this development according to Marin Housing Plan and latest final EIA (~2007?).	Infill											Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel-between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Infill										х	х
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	Strongly prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. This site is also close to the highway/commuting corridor which is a plus. Density closer to the city is preferred.	Countywide											х

1	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	וושטט ו טא נ	IIOOI	714				 				 	 		
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	The area marked on the frontage road is extremely narrow for any type of building. It would severely impact the stability of the established housing on the hillside above. In addition, you would have housing on a narrow strip where there isn't even room for a sidewalk. There is no ability to expand the frontage road where traffic and intersections already receive a failing grade. Looking at the geography, you are basically trying to cram housing into the already crowded bottom of the funnel. It makes no sense. There is no room for parking - and please do not feed us a line that people who live here will use public transportation and not own cars as that is never the case.	Countywide				х	х		х						
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	The property would be fine for housing, but the increased traffic to the nearby intersections would be untenable. Specifically, the intersections of Redwood Highway Frontage Road with Seminary Drive (at the 7-Eleven) and Tiburon Blvd to the north are both overloaded, and will be several fold worse already with the planned Seminary development within Strawberry. Adding additional housing here would further overload these intersections which have no alternative routes for traffic coming to/from the area.	Countywide				Х									
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	This would be great for seniors as it is nearby public transportation and shopping. It would be good wo	Countywide													Х
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide													Х
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Senior housing as long as it is raised up high enough not to be in a flood zone and ruin their cars— The area is congested so they couldn't build much more due to the traffic congestion.	Countywide													Χ
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Traffic is a problem.	Countywide				Х									
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard								Х					
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	4900 SFD Blvd. is an inappropriate site for housing or any kind for several reasons: It is cross crossed by streams, it is a historically agricultural property with active ag use, and it is a beloved view corridor right at the gateway of the Valley. IIThis proposal would be extremely controversial. Please consider maximizing housing at the current Woodacre fire station. From a housing advocate.	Countywide									Х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I don't think this will be feasible due to lack of infrastructure and job opportunity	Countywide		х	х										
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	If school property yes on number of units. Limit single family. Cluster housing preferred. Senior and low income.	Countywide													Х
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	No development on Sir Francis Drake in West Marin. It's already impossible to evacuate on this road.	Countywide				х						х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	No one wants to see the entrance to our Valley sullied by an enclave of homes for people earning over \$132,000 a year. This location is not inside any village boundary. And this survey will not let us show zero units at this site. It allows eight units no matter what. This survey is extremely flawed!	Countywide												х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is a terrible place to put a bunch of housing units since there is no buffer between Sir Francis Drake and the homes. Other homes in the area are not directly visible from Sir Frances Drake as these would be and would be an unwelcome eye-sore. Most homes are at least one street off of Sir Francis Drake.	Countywide									х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is agricultural land and not suitable for housing. It will destroy the entrance to the Valley. Only put new housing within the village boundaries.	Countywide									х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is out in the middle of nowhere and so this would be good for seniors if they have good public transportation to get them to shopping, banks, doctor appointments, entertainment and if there is good internet access for them to be able to stream shows and movies and do email etc Transportation is key to this remote location being a success.	Countywide													Х
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This site is completely inappropriate for development in the valley. There should be 0 units in this location, I repeat zero. This site would not be "infill". It would forever mar the open space gateway to one of the most beautiful rural valleys in the world and the Point Reyes National Park. It is not within the village boundaries as required. There would be massive community protest, legal action, and resistence to developing this site.	Countywide							x		x				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Preservation of open space/ag easement here is important to SGV community.	Enviro Hazard									х				
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Encourage more building closer to the city or Richmond Bridge, where most people commute to daily. There aren't the jobs in Novato so this will lead to increased commutes and traffic. Build closer to the city and job centers.	Countywide			х	х									
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Fire danger, sensitive and endangered species in this area. Wildlife corridor.	Countywide									Х	Х			
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Put them all here.	Countywide													Х
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Atherton Avenue is severely affected when Route 37 floods, with several hundred additional cars travelling this route. This is an area where the county has mandated minimum lot sizes and has retained the "rural, agrarian" nature of the area. As a result there are no stop signs or street lights. Developing highly dense housing in the Atherton corridor is risky until the Hwy 37 flooding problems are fixed, and once they are the housing that is built should not be at a density above 10 units per acre given the lack of infrastructure.	Enviro Hazard		x		Х				x	x				
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Don't even think about it.	Countywide							Х						

St. 2005 of Francis Change of Special Content of Process (1992) and pr		COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	J AOT GODI	IIOOIN	714								 		 	
## Settled Function Control  ## Settled Funct	`	No public transit and fire risk.	Countywide					х					Х			
Sectional Conference   The selection of Control   The selection of Control	R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo		Countywide													х
Search Verwills	Boulevard (San Geronimo		Countywide									Х				
## 11-116 Strondurty Once   St		Traffic already terrible here.	Countywide			Х										
Min - 11 Continuency universe a fairing grade and lete is not room to wount. On not feed to as limit bette people frieing in these units will use about to responsible to many the continuence and substitute responsible to the better than the lete to be continuence and substitute responsible to many the continuence and substitute responsible to the properties of the continuence and substitute responsible to the properties of the continuence and substitute responsible to the continuence and substitute responsible to the continuence and substitute responsible to the continuence and the continuen	R11 - 110 Strawberry Drive		Countywide													Х
An in the Control of C		have a failing grade and there is no room to expand. Do not feed us a line that people living in these units will use	Countywide			х				Х						
Rit - 110 Struckery Drvc Brit de transcriber of Redword Highway Frendage Road with Senimary Drive at the 7-Envery and That on Britan or Britan or Senimary development with Distruction of the Continuence of Senimary development with Distruction of the Continuence of Senimary development with Distruction of Senimary developm		decrease traffic sprawl. Also like that this site is also close to the highway/commuter corridor. Density closer to the city like this location is preferred.	Countywide													х
RT3-3600 State Route 1 (Tromates)  And of public transportation.  And of public transportatio	(Strawberry)	Specifically, the intersections of Redwood Highway Frontage Road with Seminary Drive (at the 7-Eleven) and Tiburon Blvd to the north are both overloaded, and will be several fold worse already with the planned Seminary development within Strawberry. Adding additional housing here would further overload these intersections which have no alternative routes for traffic coming to/from the area.	,			Х										
Transless   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and Inverness)   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and Inverness)   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and Inverness)   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and Inverness   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and Inverness   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and Inverness   All 1-3270 St Francis Drake   Builder and All 1-3270 St Francis Dra		Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Χ								
Sides on I contact between ref. State of the Control (Developed)  1. **Example 1.1.** State (Pines)  1. **Example 1.1.** State Route 1 (Pines)  1. **Example 1.1.* State Route 1 (Pin	(Tomales)	Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Χ								
This is downthrown inverses. Seal ever file, water reactioning, septoc concerns apport to rise as a sub cnock.  In this process of the control of the contro		sites on Tomales Bay are not suitable due to sea level rise	Enviro Hazard								Х					
Boulevard (Inveneses) where infrastructure and infilling can be maximized. In the Worth State (Pt. Reyne State) and the England (Inveneses) an		This is downtown Inverness. Sea level rise, water rationing, septic concerns all point to this as a bad choice.	Infill							Χ	Х		Χ	Χ		
RIG-60 Film Street (Pt. Reys Station)  This is half of the developed commercial area in a small town, already overtaxed by fouriern. Water availability is a process for the case of process station area. Traffic and parking problems exist floation.  RIG-10 Film Street (Pt. Reys Station)  RIG-10 Film Street (Pt. Reys Station)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems exist floation.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys Land parking problems and restriction.)  RIG-1100 State Route 1 (Pt. Reys			Infill					Х				Х	Х	Х		
This is half of the developed commercial area in a small town, attendary overdaxed by courtsm. Water availability is a sorious question for the residents now. Septic issues exist due to a high water table. Sea level rise will impact this area. Traffic and patring problems exist today.  Lack of public transportation.  Countywide  Enviro Hazard  Envir			Countywide					Х								
Reves Station) Ri7- 11598 State Route 1 (Pt. Reves Station) Ri7- 11598 State Route 1 (Pt. Reves Station) This is a rural area with serious infrastructure considerations and restrictions. Water availability is questionable, waste water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerning should be a fragilic creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exist	R16 - 60 Fifth Street (Pt. Reyes	serious question for the residents now. Septic issues exist due to a high water table. Sea level rise will impact this	Infill			Х	х				х			х		
Revers Station)  R17 - 11588 State Route 1 (Pt. Rise) is a rural area with serious infrastructure considerations and restrictions. Water variability is questionable, waster water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these substitutions about a final the curst water concerns a solution. A county will be a control on the concerns a solution of the control of t		Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Х								
water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these issues. Infilling urban/subrban areas is preferable.  R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)  R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R3 - North Knoll Road and St. Access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially unit he save which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillisides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-lenart housing. The current rain fine backing up at the Tiburopible. There are NO additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.*  Access to this location is not and any use are imply adding 50 or hew cars (please do not ty and say this is transport in fine tanged that the people here and any user are imply adding 50 or hew cars (please do not ty and say this is transport in fine that people here and any user are imply adding 50 or hew cars (please do not ty and say this is transport and f		no septic. no safe egress/ingress for 60 units ( #100+/- cars 2 x daily). hilly topography. on watershed	Enviro Hazard			Х						Х	Х	Х		
and the fourist traffic that has to go through Tam Junction. Muir Woods get's a million visitors a year, Muir Beach, Countywide Stinson, and Mt. Tam and MMWD all get millions of visitors and probably all of that traffic goes through Tam Junction  R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)  R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)  R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.  Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  X  Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.  R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  Access to this location is horrible. There are NO sidewalks already to and from the location. People are almost hit daily and only and you are simply additing 50+ new care (please do not yn and say his transportation friendly and that people here  Countywide	`	water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these	Infill						х		х	Х		х		
Tallic and life lisk are a problem.   Tallic and life lisk are a problem.   Countywide   X   X   X   X   X   X   X   X   X		about all the tourist traffic that has to go through Tam Junction. Muir Woods get's a million visitors a year, Muir Beach,	Countywide			х										
(Tamalpais) Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.  Countywide Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.  Countywide Traffic is a problem.  R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais) Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map  The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire out. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Bivd/Bilthedale exit is already to and from the location. People are almost hit daily walking on North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R3 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R4 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R5 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R6 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R7 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R8 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R8 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)		Traffic and fire risk are a problem.	Countywide			Х							Х			
(Tamalpais)  R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R3 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R5 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R6 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R7 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R8 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R8 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)  R9 - North Knoll Road There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here		Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide													Х
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map  Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map  Enviro Hazard  The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing. The current taffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."  Access to this location is horrible. There are NO sidewalks already to and from the location. People are almost hit daily walking on North Knoll Road. There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here		Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.	Countywide			Х										
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)  Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map  "The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."  Access to this location is horrible. There are NO sidewalks already to and from the location. People are almost hit daily walking on North Knoll Road. There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here	R19 - Tennessee Valley Road	Traffic is a problem.	Countywide			Х										
"The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."  Access to this location is horrible. There are NO sidewalks already to and from the location. People are almost hit daily walking on North Knoll Road. There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here	R19 - Tennessee Valley Road	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard								Х					
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Walking on North Knoll Road. There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here	R2 - North Knoll Road and St.	is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."	,			х				Х			х			
		walking on North Knoll Road. There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here				х	х		х				х			

The material process and surge of the coloration. That Makes (and county for the coloration. The Makes (and county for the coloration. The Makes (and coloration) and coloration. The Makes (and colo	1	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	3 AO 1 00011	יוטטוי	714			 							
22. Host North Root and all Ministry (Principle of the Company of	R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)		Countywide		х		х				Х	х	х		
The seas Entire (Serveyters)  20 - North Moral Road and all,  This is stated or externed from the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all is extended by the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all is extended by the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road and all in the feel in Househ Priors (Received from st. 47) North Moral Road (Received from st.	R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	Strongly prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. This site is also right along the highway/commuting corridor which is a plus. Density closer to	Countywide												х
Reg. Power for Repair and St. Transact Registration for now Series for Journal within a mount needed for societies for now Series for Journal with a mount needed for societies for now Series for Journal with needed for societies for now Series for Journal with needed for societies for now Series for Journal with needed for Journal with needed for now Series for Journal with needed for Journ	R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	There is already multi unit housing in the area. Traffic is a problem.	Countywide				Х		Х						
Thomas Demos (Strandburry)  The Stratifies Central and with an accumulation of their schools on window.  The Stratifies Central and appropriets for high prices of the Stratifies Central and Stratifies Centr	R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	fine location for more Senior housing which is much needed for boomers born 1946-1964 who are falling into homelessness with more and more frequency. Marin Food Bank could deliver food and Extra Food too since they	Countywide											х	x
Adding units will exceed bethe house issues. The particular site is in an accessable externe dept. Adding light dentity housing to the site will all dis destry be family replicational currander by one process. Peace according repulsarity housing the site will all dis destry. The family replications of the process of the	R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	This is pristine natural land with an abundance of local species of wildlife.	Countywide								Х				
Frontage Road (Ahmonite)  This shift all self but was in a Redevelopment and presented, Autory deep received in the process of	R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	adding units will exacerbate those issues. This particular site is in an inaccessible extreme slope. Adding high density housing to this site will also destroy the family neighborhood surrounded by open space. Please consider repurposing	Countywide				х		X		x				
Frontage Road (Amonte)  20 - 260 Redwood Highway  Frontage Road (Amonte)  The Infill site that was in a Redevelopment area decades ago, is presently coned for a Hotel, with a garage built under the building, adjusent to Richardson bay resilience SIR projections and interactive map  The Infill site that was in a Redevelopment area decades ago, is presently coned for a Hotel, with a garage built under the building, adjusent to Richardson Bay, a 100,000 SF. Office building on the North and a househood community with addressing Climate change, a seek with see and chardson the seek and addressing Climate change, a seek with see and chardson the seek and see	R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide												Х
This Indition that we will be the time in a few development are addressed as go, is presently zoned for a Hotel, with a gasage built under the building, adjacent to Richardson Bay, a 100,000 SF. Office building on the North and a houseboat community with an Office building on the North and A phase building on the North A phase building on the	R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)		Countywide				Х			Х					
the building, adjacent to Richardson Bay, a 100,000 S.F. Office building on the South Sed, A distinctively designed building with salet-off-the-ort innovable deminests addressing Climate change, Soal ever in and other changing environmental conditions in crisis mode, such as addressing Climate change, Soal ever in the orthogonal conditions in crisis mode, such as addressing Climate change, Soal ever in the condition of the state of the state of the condition of the state of the condition of the state of the condition of the state of the sta	R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard							Х					
West Marin's traffic and M'v's traffic. The entire Tam junction needs total rebuild and redesign before any additional countywide	R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	the building, adjacent to Richardson Bay, a 100,000 S.F. Office building on the North and a houseboat community with an Office building on the South side. A distinctively designed building with state-of-the-art innovative elements addressing Climate change, Sea level rise and other changing environmental conditions in crisis mode, such as flooding, fire, power outages, etc. could provide very convenient work force, senior and affordable Housing, together with a Hotel, consisting of several stories of coexisting living- featuring materials and components that would demonstrate how imaginative and solution oriented goals can be attained, while getting cars off the road and facilitating the use of bicycles, buses, walking and jogging to nearby destinations - while also providing jobs and educating prospective workers in the construction, maintenance and service in the hospitality Industry. The substantial fees received by the county of Marin and monies spent with the nearby merchants and businesses would be of great													х
Tamalpais) very often and so this would not add to much traffic congestion if they were given senior housing there.  201 - 2040 Flamingo Road Tamalpais)  Storymaps arogis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map  Enviro Hazard  Enviro Hazard  Enviro Hazard  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X	R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	West Marin's traffic and MV's traffic. The entire Tam junction needs total rebuild and redesign before any additional	Countywide				х								
Tamalpais) Subtyrings angles of michitalison bay resilience Str. projections and interactive map (and the proposed of a price) and the proposed of a price (Unincorporated Fairfax) as a terrible place to do massive development. SFD bivd is slammed with all kinds of traffic. Local and tourist traffic. Pt. Reyes, Olema, Stinson, MMWD all get millions of visitors a year- all of which travel on SFD.  Countywide  Cou	R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)		Countywide												Х
Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  R23 - 275 Olive Avenue  (Blackpoint)  R3 - 275 Olive Avenue  (Blackpoint)  R3 - 299 Olive Avenue  (Blackpoint)  R5 - 299 Olive Avenue  (Blackpoint)  R5 - 299 Olive Avenue  (Blackpoint)  R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)  Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.  R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)  Placing additional units here wouldn't be in line with the "Address Racial Equity and Historic Patterns of Segregation"  Equation (Suntywide)  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  Countywide  X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard							Х					
Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax) Prefer other housing closer to the highway/commuting corridor and closer to the city for shorter commute to jobs.  Prefer other housing closer to the highway/commuting corridor and closer to the city for shorter commute to jobs.  This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Prefer more density in other locations that are closer to the city.  There are lots of agricultural workers in West Marin who would benefit from affordable housing in Nicasio.  There are lots of agricultural workers in West Marin who would benefit from affordable housing in Nicasio.  This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Density in other locations closer to the city is preferred.  R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)  Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.  Countywide  X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)		Countywide				х								
Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)  This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Prefer more density in other locations that are closer to the city.  There are lots of agricultural workers in West Marin who would benefit from affordable housing in Nicasio.  Countywide  This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing in Nicasio.  Countywide  This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Density in other locations closer to the city is preferred.  R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)  Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.  Countywide  X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)		Countywide												Х
R3 - 275 Olive Avenue any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Prefer more density in other locations that are closer to the city.  R4 - 5600 Nicasio Valley Road (Nicasio)  There are lots of agricultural workers in West Marin who would benefit from affordable housing in Nicasio.  This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Density in other locations closer to the city is preferred.  Countywide  X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)	Prefer other housing closer to the highway/commuting corridor and closer to the city for shorter commute to jobs.	Countywide			Х									
This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Density in other locations closer to the city is preferred.  R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City) Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.  Countywide  X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	R3 - 275 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion	Countywide			х	х	х							
This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Density in other locations closer to the city is preferred.  R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City) Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.  Countywide  X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	R4 - 5600 Nicasio Valley Road (Nicasio)	There are lots of agricultural workers in West Marin who would benefit from affordable housing in Nicasio.	Countywide												Х
P6 Denables Street (Marin City) Placing additional units here wouldn't be in line with the "Address Racial Equity and Historic Patterns of Segregation"	R5 - 299 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion	Countywide			х	х	х							
	R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)	Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide												Х
	R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)		Equity											х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	C ACT CODI	 J14										
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	"The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."	Countywide		x			Х			Х			
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Eagle Rock is already pretty well built-out. The ability to turn off of the main intersection here is already hotly contested. This would be more cars with the inability to turn to go home. Do not feed us all the line that people who live here will not have cars and will only use public transportation. That never turns out to be the case.	Countywide		x	х								
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Incredibly steep terrain; no room for 32 units; no water hook-up, access or other infrastructure, which could lead to neighborhood evacuation problems in a fire-prone area; already bad traffic on tiburon boulevard; abundant wildlife with nowhere to go if you destroy their habitat	,	х	Х			х	Х		x	х		
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. Also like that this site is closer to the highway/commuting corridor.	Countywide											Х
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	This is pristine natural land with an abundance of local species of wildlife.	Countywide						Х					
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	This is the next street over from me as I live in Kruger Pines 47 N Knoll Road- we would need a traffic light put at N Knoll Rd & Tiburon Blvd redo that intersection and make N Knoll Road a county maintained road too as it is just pot holes now and getting worse. The traffic has to be very aggressive leaving the neighborhood to make a right turn to get on the 101. There is no way to make left turns at all onto Tiburon Blvd. so that whole intersection needs to be redone. It could be family and workforce up on Eagle Rock and put the seniors on N. Knoll Road.	Countywide		Х								х	х
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	This site is not appropriate for high density housing. The Eagle Rock neighborhood already has traffic problems, and adding units will exacerbate those issues. This particular site is on extreme slope - likely a 30% grade. Adding high density housing to this site will also destroy the family neighborhood surrounded by open space. Please consider repurposing more urban locations.	Countywide		Х			Х	Х					
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Traffic is horrible in this area. Also there is a lot of street parking on Eagle Rock. Adding additional housing will only cause worse conditions. The open space on ring mountain is home to many wildlife (owls, coyotes, turkey, deer and bobcats not to mention smaller animals as well.)	Countywide		Х	х		х	х					
R8 - 8901 Redwood Boulevard (North Novato)	Fire risk and lack of water for more residents. This appears to be over a state park. No development on a state park.	Countywide						Х		Х	Х		
R8 - 8901 Redwood Boulevard (North Novato)	Prefer more building down south near the city/jobs, for shorter commutes, less traffic, and less sprawl.	Countywide		Х				Х					
R8 - 8901 Redwood Boulevard (North Novato)	Too close to important Miwok site.	Enviro Hazard		Х					Х				
R9 - Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Quentin)	l raffic to get to the bridge is already terrible. Reroute the road going to the bridge and this would be a good location.	Countywide		Х									
Total RHNA Allocation	This is far too much that is being shoved down into the funnel where there is little land available (Strawberry, Marin City). The County needs to be aggressive and pushing back on ABAG and the state. San Francisco has over 40,000 vacant properties so let Weiner deal with getting San Francisco vacancies down and stop shoving the issue onto Marin.	Countywide											

1 41	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCINO				OFD	TDE	DDIC	DTD	AOT	NIME	054	NAT	0111	- FID	14/A T		Геот	ODI
Location A - 2754 Novato Boulevard	Comment	Scenario	PCL	INF	SER	IKF	PRK	PIK	ACI	NIVIR	SEA	NAI	CUL			HLT	EQT	GDL
(North Novato)	Fire risk and lack of water.	Countywide												Х	Χ	<u> </u>	<b>└</b>	<u> </u>
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	The traffic on the streets between this parcel and the freeway are a congested mess already. Building in this fire zone will make inflow and outflow as well as access to emergency services so highly compacted that it will result in tragedy.	Countywide				х								Х				
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	This allows people to stay in Marin County whereas they are moving into Sonoma County now so I prefer this site to keep families living in Marin — but the road needs to be widened to absorb the extra traffic and people pulling out to make left and right turns, etc. This needs nice frontage roads too for slower traffic to be able to get out onto the 101 and off safely.	Countywide																х
A - 2754 Novato Boulevard (North Novato)	Near Novato schools and infrastructure. Near freeway.	Infill																Х
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	Another horrendous place for such a massive building. Seal level rise, Manzanita already floods almost monthly - way too much traffic on hwy 1. Stinson, muir woods, Mt. Tam and muir beach get millions of visitors. Need to build a highway to serve all that traffic, completely redesing Tam junction. And many of MV residents go through the area. Bad, bad place to ram housing in.	Countywide				х					х							
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	As long as this area is raised so that the units are not subject to flooding and same with their cars parking and housing need to be built above king tides and flood levels and then that would be fine.	Countywide									Х							Х
B - 160 Shoreline Highway	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide															Ь	Χ
B - 160 Shoreline Highway	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard									Χ						↓	
C - 935 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Kentfield)	workforce housing, college student housing, family housing as long as there is parking for all their cars. Parking is key to the success of this as they need their cars to get to work and take younger kids to their schools too.	Countywide														l	Х	Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Closer to the city (than Novato) so a little less commute time. Close to bus lines. Wish it was closer to more amenities though there are a few grocery stores/markets nearby.	Countywide			Х													Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Higher density as close to Hwy 101 makes the most sense.	Countywide																Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Is any thought given to the planning for family needs,heritage trees, drainage and creeks, earthquake and slides.?  What about quality of life?Reduce the numbers and come up with healthful considerations	Countywide		Х	Х					Х		Х						
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	There is no spare land in this neighborhood. All parcels are occupied. Streets don't have sidewalks and are narrow.	Countywide							х	х		х		х	Х			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	This area could handle 4 plex apartment units and this would be good for families, workforce, seniors too.	Countywide																Х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Why can't I adjust the number of units at this site?	Countywide																
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	Building in the southeast section of this parcel on the open fields would likely upset a lot of people in the neighborhood. The area is essentially a public park and the paths around the fields are are heavily trafficked by walkers and families. I think people would be more supportive of filling in areas in the southwest and north of the property, or replacing existing buildings/facilities with housing.	Countywide								х		х						х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	No public transit (one road in and out) and fire risk.	Countywide						Х						Х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Vallev)	This area is now Lucas Valley Park and has been since the late 1990s. Inappropriate.	Countywide										Х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This is already pretty far out and it would be fine for both workforce and senior housing and the seniors need to have access to good public transportation options so they can get food, to the bank, to the doctor, etc.	Countywide																Х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	this website is not a reliable way to seek community feedback. It assumes that each participant is familiar with all the sites in Marin County in order to move the housing around. Specifically on Jeannette Prandi housing, my opinion would be to expand on the low income senior housing that is already there- 50 units would likely double the existing senior housing and be plenty for the heavily trafficked LUCAS VALLEY Road and surrounding community.	Countywide															х	х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	Unlike 55 Marinwood Avenue, the areas further West within this section of Lucas Valley would be a dangerous area for new housing. The narrow valley with strong Western Wind shares similarities with the town of Paradise and its fatal experience with Fire. The green space at Jeannette Prandi Way is the only fire break within a dense construction of highly inflammable houses (resembling the Boulder, CO, neighborhood that burned this winder). For this valley to takes its fair share of county-wide new housing, the most intelligent solution would be to redevelop 55 Marinwood.	Countywide												Х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	the road and size of land is really good for dense suburban homes	Enviro Hazard																Х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This area is already developed:Lucas ValleyPark. See Marin County Parks.	Enviro Hazard										Х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This area is now Lucas Valley Park.	Equity										Х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	There should be, no development at this site, It's now a park-Lucas Valley Park and has been since the late 1990s, It was developed such as part of the development of the 80-unit Rotary Valley Vilage development.	Infill										Х						
F - 190 A Donahue Street (Marin City)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide																Х
F - 190 A Donahue Street (Marin City)	Ideal location close to shopping and jobs.	Countywide																Х
	Placing additional units here wouldn't be in line with the "Address Racial Equity and Historic Patterns of Segregation" Scenario because there is already a majority of publis housing and low income units in Marin City	Equity															х	

O 455 Maniana 1.5	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING		iiiooic	אכ		1			1	1				1	1		
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I would like to see the housing that should have been built by Bridge Housing years ago for seniors and families finally get built it will be a great addition to the neighborhood and is very much needed.	Countywide															Χ
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	The redevelopment is a good idea. The blighted area will benefit from redevelopment, and I hear from neighbors that they are welcoming this idea. In the case of a fire there is a close exit to Hwy 101. I reduced the number of houses, because even with 110 units this small community is already taking a large share of the country-wide burden for new housing, and other intelligent options are available.	Countywide															х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	this website is not a reliable way to seek community feedback. It assumes that each participant is familiar with all the sites in Marin County in order to move the housing around. Specifically on Marinwood Market housing, my opinion would be to develop this property as previously discussed many time before. I'm not sure on the details of how much housing this site can hold, but it has close freeway access and a market nearby and would be a good site for housing.	Countywide															x
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	Housing that matches the homes in the neighborhood. The market must stay	Enviro Hazard															Х
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Senior Housing would have the least amount of impact on the traffic so this would be a nice size senior community and go along with Venetia Oaks which is there already. Food bank and Extra Food and Meals on Wheels already goes to Venetia Oaks and this is a nice area for Seniors to reside in.	Countywide															х
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Traffic already terrible. Close to open space. Hard to get out if there was a fire as only one road in and out. No water for more residents. Not a good candidate for this plan.	Countywide				Х						Х	Х	Х			
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I live in Santa Venetia and this is too many housing units for this area (North San Pedro and Vendola drive). There is already a parking problem and it is sometimes difficult to find parking in front of your own home. Also, there is traffic congestion in front of the school in the morning and afternoon. You also have to take into account that Terra Linda Northgate wants to build over 1000 units in a small area. I realize they are not part of unincorporated Marin but the quality of life will definitely decline in Santa Venetia and surrounding areas with all these additional units when you take into account the traffic and increase in population. Per the housing meeting last week it stated that Santa Venetia along with Marin City already have a high number of low income residents. Is the additional housing going to be above market housing or are you just going to continue to place all low income residents in Santa Venetia?					x	×			X						x	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Should be avoided - is within 5 ft. sea level rise projection zone by 2100	Enviro Hazard									Х						
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I object to 251 N. San Pedro as a building site for housing. There is a school and ball field. The children and their families need the child center. The ball field is used by little league and other children playing. The neighborhood can't absorb more cars parking in it. We don't have enough parking for the people who live here or there guests. If housing need to be build in Santa Venetia why not 1565 Vendola? The old school has been vacant for years. The property is not being used at all.	Countywide			x		х										
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Senior housing would be the least amount of traffic congestion impact and they could take public transit to get to where they needed to go for bank, grocery, doctor, etc.	Countywide															Х
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Traffic is already terrible in this neighborhood. Bordered by open space. Fire risk is high and it's already hard to get out with only one road in. There is not enough water for more residents. Not a good candidate for this plan.	Countywide				х						х	Х	х			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	This site does not fit this criteria. Public transportation is limited. These units will bring 2-4 cars per unit with no ample parking which would impact NSP road and nearby neighborhoods. NSP road is only 2 lanes with many schools along the way. Adding more cars would not only add to an already congested road it would be dangerous for those walking and riding bikes	Equity				х	х	x	х								
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	This proposed site is on a baseball field that is used by many for recreational purposes. This is a much needed baseball field. Field use is hard to come by. This field is also home to a variety of wildlife. Generations of quail. Night heron, egrets, owls hawks and many other bird species. As well as frogs coyote raccoon opossum squirrel fox deer. This site is not suitable for such a large housing project. This would significantly impact our environment	Infill			X							х					
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	Excellent location to build more housing and could support some commercial as well.	Countywide															Х
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	For those who like the outdoor rural life seniors and workforce housing for West Marin Employees to have a place to live that is affordable, this would be very nice.	Countywide															Х
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	This is a tiny rural village with very few services available including fire, medical, etc. Development must be kept to a miniumum for safety concerns.	Countywide			Х							Х	Х				
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	Should occur on north/west side of Rt. 1 / SFD Blvd. to avoid sea level rise zones.	Enviro Hazard									Х						Х
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	This area is already developed. Drinking water concerns, septic concerns, fire safety and evacuation concerns. Sea level rise and climate change will exacerbate these issues at this site.	Infill								Х	Х		Х	Х			
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	Housing should only be added in the valley and low hillsides. Mid to upper hillsides and ridgelines should be open space. If the housing can be kept in the valley, it would be reasonable to increase to 36 total houses. Another consideration is that traffic on Butterfield is congested. If more housing is added, then traffic lights and pedestrian crossings with warning lights should be added.	Countywide				х						х					х
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	I would like to see MORE housing units here. This is the end of the line, at the end of Butterfield Road out in the country and it would be good or workforce housing and seniors as long as there was a bus line that went that far to take them to doctor appointments and shopping. It would be fine for schoolsfamilies also.	Countywide															Х
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	Near open space. High fire risk. Lack of water for additional residents. Traffic already terrible in and out of this area.	Countywide				Х						Х	Х	Х			
L - 26500 Main Street (Tomales)	Senior housing would do well here for those who want country rural living with access to transportation for getting food , to the bank, to the doctor maybe a medical clinic bus could make the rounds to these rural areas where seniors would be residing so they could get checked out and get prescriptions, check ups, shots, blood draw, etc.	Countywide															х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCINA		1	Ť			1		1					1	
L - 26500 Main Street (Tomales)	Tomales does not have enough water or jobs to add this many units.	Countywide			Х								Х		
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Along the 101 corridor; room for more than this number; included in Marin Housing Pan.	Countywide													Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St.	I would love to see this developed for families, seniors, workforce housing all kinds of housing built on this site as it is	Countywide												Х	Χ
Vincents)  M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	perfect and beautiful and much preferable to living further out Lucas Valley road.  St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel—between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Countywide												х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This seems like a more economically realistic area, good access to 101 and infrastructure	Countywide													Χ
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	this website is not a reliable way to seek community feedback. It assumes that each participant is familiar with all the sites in Marin County in order to move the housing around. Some confusion at this site about 1800 vs 221 units- big difference. My opinion is that some development could happen at this site, but 1800 would be a huge burden to the traffic on the 101 in this area and could not be supported by the existing marinwood infrastucture	Countywide								х					Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Traffic is going to be a problem. Lack of water.	Countywide				Х							Х		
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	403 units is much less than the capacity at St Vincent's. This is an area that could absorb a mix of housing types, and is close to highway 101.	Enviro Hazard												Х	Χ
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Should be placed on this parcel but above 5 ft rise zone.	Enviro Hazard									Х				Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapelbetween US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Enviro Hazard												х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel—between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Enviro Hazard												х	X
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Marin Housing plan provides for this scale of development at St Vincent.	Equity													Х
•	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel-between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Equity												х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	The St. Vincent's property is nearly 800 acres within the US 101 corridorclose to transportation and services, a prime location for housing. Much of the property is located at higher elevations, so not subject to sea level rise. The area with greatest potential for housing development is located west of Holy Rosary Chapel (between the Chapel and US 101), where existing terrain would shield it from view from US 101, thereby maintaining the visual corridor. This area could accommodate all levels and densities of housing as a planned development.	Equity												х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Why so many here?	Equity								Х					
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	St Vincent and Siviera Ranch can accommodate this development according to Marin Housing Plan and latest final EIA (~2007?).	Infill													Х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St.	St. Vincents consists of nearly 800 acres of land situated in the US 101 corridor. Its proximity to transportation and services makes it ideal for development of housing of all types and at all levels of affordability. The most developable portion of the St. Vincents property is that land located west of Holy Rosary Chapel-between US 101 and the Chapel. This land is on higher ground and not subject to sea level rise. Further, existing terrain provides a natural buffer such that housing can be located on the site without affecting the visual corridor; development would not be visible from US 101. This property should be further studied to determine just how many units can be accommodated here. It is the ideal site.	Infill												х	х
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	Strongly prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. This site is also close to the highway/commuting corridor which is a plus. Density closer to the city is preferred.	Countywide													Х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	O AO I GODII	iiooit	<i>/</i> /19				 				 	 		
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	The area marked on the frontage road is extremely narrow for any type of building. It would severely impact the stability of the established housing on the hillside above. In addition, you would have housing on a narrow strip where there isn't even room for a sidewalk. There is no ability to expand the frontage road where traffic and intersections already receive a failing grade. Looking at the geography, you are basically trying to cram housing into the already crowded bottom of the funnel. It makes no sense. There is no room for parking - and please do not feed us a line that people who live here will use public transportation and not own cars as that is never the case.	Countywide				х	х		Х						
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	The property would be fine for housing, but the increased traffic to the nearby intersections would be untenable. Specifically, the intersections of Redwood Highway Frontage Road with Seminary Drive (at the 7-Eleven) and Tiburon Blvd to the north are both overloaded, and will be several fold worse already with the planned Seminary development within Strawberry. Adding additional housing here would further overload these intersections which have no alternative routes for traffic coming toffrom the area.	Countywide				х									
N - 690 Redwood Hwy Frontage Road (Strawberry)	This would be great for seniors as it is nearby public transportation and shopping. It would be good wo	Countywide													Х
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide													Х
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Senior housing as long as it is raised up high enough not to be in a flood zone and ruin their cars The area is congested so they couldn't build much more due to the traffic congestion.	Countywide													Х
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Traffic is a problem.	Countywide				Х									
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard								Х					
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	4900 SFD Blvd. is an inappropriate site for housing or any kind for several reasons: It is cross crossed by streams, it is a historically agricultural property with active ag use, and it is a beloved view corridor right at the gateway of the Valley. IIThis proposal would be extremely controversial. Please consider maximizing housing at the current Woodacre fire station. From a housing advocate.	Countywide									Х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I don't think this will be feasible due to lack of infrastructure and job opportunity	Countywide		X	х										
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	If school property yes on number of units. Limit single family. Cluster housing preferred. Senior and low income.	Countywide													х
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	No development on Sir Francis Drake in West Marin. It's already impossible to evacuate on this road.	Countywide				х						х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	No one wants to see the entrance to our Valley sullied by an enclave of homes for people earning over \$132,000 a year. This location is not inside any village boundary. And this survey will not let us show zero units at this site. It allows eight units no matter what. This survey is extremely flawed!	Countywide												х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is a terrible place to put a bunch of housing units since there is no buffer between Sir Francis Drake and the homes. Other homes in the area are not directly visible from Sir Frances Drake as these would be and would be an unwelcome eye-sore. Most homes are at least one street off of Sir Francis Drake.	Countywide									х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is agricultural land and not suitable for housing. It will destroy the entrance to the Valley. Only put new housing within the village boundaries.	Countywide									Х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is out in the middle of nowhere and so this would be good for seniors if they have good public transportation to get them to shopping, banks, doctor appointments, entertainment and if there is good internet access for them to be able to stream shows and movies and do email etc Transportation is key to this remote location being a success.	Countywide													Х
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This site is completely inappropriate for development in the valley. There should be 0 units in this location, I repeat zero. This site would not be "infill". It would forever mar the open space gateway to one of the most beautiful rural valleys in the world and the Point Reyes National Park. It is not within the village boundaries as required. There would be massive community protest, legal action, and resistence to developing this site.	Countywide							х		x				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Preservation of open space/ag easement here is important to SGV community.	Enviro Hazard									х				
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Encourage more building closer to the city or Richmond Bridge, where most people commute to daily. There aren't the jobs in Novato so this will lead to increased commutes and traffic. Build closer to the city and job centers.	Countywide			х	х									
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Fire danger, sensitive and endangered species in this area. Wildlife corridor.	Countywide									Х	Х			
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Put them all here.	Countywide													Х
Q - 800 Atherton Avenue (North Novato)	Atherton Avenue is severely affected when Route 37 floods, with several hundred additional cars travelling this route. This is an area where the county has mandated minimum lot sizes and has retained the "rural, agrarian" nature of the area. As a result there are no stop signs or street lights. Developing highly dense housing in the Atherton corridor is risky until the Hwy 37 flooding problems are fixed, and once they are the housing that is built should not be at a density above 10 units per acre given the lack of infrastructure.	Enviro Hazard		Х		х				Х	Х				
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Don't even think about it.	Countywide							Х						
															_

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	ACI SUBI	11221	UN											
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	No public transit and fire risk.	Countywide					х					х			
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Vallev)	Point Reyes is a great place to build more housing. Lovely community, local businesses would greatly benefit from more weekday patrons.	Countywide													Х
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This site should only be used for the fire dept. or for other public community services with the currently existing building. It's part of a large open space property that needs to continue to be preserved as open space in perpetuity.	Countywide									Х				
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Traffic already terrible here.	Countywide			Х										
R11 - 110 Strawberry Drive (Strawberry)	Family Housing and workforce housing would be nice hereas long as there is plenty of parking for the new residents as parking is key	Countywide													Х
R11 - 110 Strawberry Drive (Strawberry)	Strawberry Drive is already impacted with very little ingress or egress. 28 is FAR TOO MUCH. All intersections here have a failing grade and there is no room to expand. Do not feed us a line that people living in these units will use public transportation as it has been proven time and time again that is not the case.	Countywide			х				х						
R11 - 110 Strawberry Drive (Strawberry)	Strongly prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. Also like that this site is also close to the highway/commuter corridor. Density closer to the city like this location is preferred.	Countywide													Х
R11 - 110 Strawberry Drive (Strawberry)	The property would be fine for housing, but the increased traffic to the nearby intersections would be untenable. Specifically, the intersections of Redwood Highway Frontage Road with Seminary Drive (at the 7-Eleven) and Tiburon Blvd to the north are both overloaded, and will be several fold worse already with the planned Seminary development within Strawberry. Adding additional housing here would further overload these intersections which have no alternative routes for traffic coming to/from the area.	Countywide			Х										
R12 - Mesa Road (Bolinas)	Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Χ								
R13 - 26600 State Route 1 (Tomales)	Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Х								
R14 - 13270 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Inverness)	sites on Tomales Bay are not suitable due to sea level rise	Enviro Hazard								Х					
R14 - 13270 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Inverness)	This is downtown Inverness. Sea level rise, water rationing, septic concerns all point to this as a bad choice.	Infill							Х	Х		Х	Х		
R15 -12785 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Inverness)	Rural area with serious water availability and fire safety issues. Transportation is non-existent. Use sub/urban sites where infrastructure and infilling can be maximized.	Infill					Х				Х	Х	Х		
R16 - 60 Fifth Street (Pt. Reyes Station)	Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Х								
R16 - 60 Fifth Street (Pt. Reyes Station)	This is half of the developed commercial area in a small town, already overtaxed by tourism. Water availability is a serious question for the residents now. Septic issues exist due to a high water table. Sea level rise will impact this area. Traffic and parking problems exist today.	Infill			Х	Х				Х			Х		
R17 - 11598 State Route 1 (Pt. Reyes Station)	Lack of public transportation.	Countywide					Х								
R17 - 11598 State Route 1 (Pt. Reyes Station)	no septic. no safe egress/ingress for 60 units ( #100+/- cars 2 x daily). hilly topography. on watershed	Enviro Hazard			Χ						Х	Х	Х		
R17 - 11598 State Route 1 (Pt. Reyes Station)	This is a rural area with serious infrastructure considerations and restrictions. Water availability is questionable, waste water concerns above a fragile creek side ecosystem. Fire danger exists. Climate change will only exacerbate these issues. Infilling urban/suburban areas is preferable.	Infill						Х		Х	Х		х		
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	There is way too much traffic in Tam Junction. It is the worst place imaginable to add more housing. Everyone forgets about all the tourist traffic that has to go through Tam Junction. Muir Woods get's a million visitors a year, Muir Beach, Stinson, and Mt. Tam and MMWD all get millions of visitors and probably all of that traffic goes through Tam Junction	Countywide			X										
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Traffic and fire risk are a problem.	Countywide			Х							Х			
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide													Χ
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	Same thing, Tam junction is already slammed with traffic.	Countywide			Х										
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	Traffic is a problem.	Countywide			Х										
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard								Х					
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	"The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."	Countywide			х				х			х			
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	Access to this location is horrible. There are NO sidewalks already to and from the location. People are almost hit daily walking on North Knoll Road. There is NO ability to add sidewalks due to the topography. The streets here are narrow and you are simply adding 50+ new cars (please do not try and say this is transportation friendly and that people here won't own cars).	Countywide			Х	Х		Х				Х			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	G ACT SUBIN	liooid	אכ			 	 						
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	No infrastructure including water hook-up, endangered plant species and wildlife habitats threatened. No easy traffic access including for fire evacuation. That hillside just caught fire in 2021; noisy right next to freeway at hill due to cars and trucks revving engines to get over hill	Countywide		х		Х				Х	Х	Х		
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	Strongly prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. This site is also right along the highway/commuting corridor which is a plus. Density closer to the city like this location is preferred.	Countywide												х
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	There is already multi unit housing in the area. Traffic is a problem.	Countywide				Х		Х						
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	This is around the corner from where I live in Kruger Pines Retirement Home at 47 N Knoll Road and this would be a fine location for more Senior housing which is much needed for boomers born 1946-1964 who are falling into homelessness with more and more frequency. Marin Food Bank could deliver food and Extra Food too since they already come here. This would be a welcome, much needed addition to the neighborhood.	Countywide											х	х
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	This is pristine natural land with an abundance of local species of wildlife.	Countywide								Х				
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	This site is not appropriate for high density housing. The Eagle Rock neighborhood already has traffic problems, and adding units will exacerbate those issues. This particular site is in an inaccessible extreme slope. Adding high density housing to this site will also destroy the family neighborhood surrounded by open space. Please consider repurposing more urban locations.	Countywide				х		х		х				
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	Density closer to the city like this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide												Х
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	prone to flooding, seal level rise and traffic on 101 horrible and traffic through Tam junction horrible. Wrong place to add more housing	Countywide				Х			Х					
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard							Х					
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	This Infill site that was in a Redevelopment area decades ago, is presently zoned for a Hotel, with a garage built under the building, adjacent to Richardson Bay, a 100,000 S.F. Office building on the North and a houseboat community with an Office building on the South side. A distinctively designed building with state-of-the-art innovative elements addressing Climate change, Sea level rise and other changing environmental conditions in crisis mode, such as flooding, fire, power outages, etc. could provide very convenient work force, senior and affordable Housing, together with a Hotel, consisting of several stories of coexisting living- featuring materials and components that would demonstrate how imaginative and solution oriented goals can be attained, while getting cars off the road and facilitating the use of bicycles, buses, walking and jogging to nearby destinations - while also providing jobs and educating prospective workers in the construction, maintenance and service in the hospitality Industry. The substantial fees received by the county of Marin and monies spent with the nearby merchants and businesses would be of great value to the countywide community!	Infill												х
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	Again, Tam junction - already beyond carrying capacity. Why doesn't anyone do a traffic study? We're getting all of West Marin's traffic and MV's traffic. The entire Tam junction needs total rebuild and redesign before any additional housing is put there. This should be obvious.	Countywide				х								
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	This looks like a good site to put 21 housing units in for seniors we need more senior housing and they do not go far very often and so this would not add to much traffic congestion if they were given senior housing there.	Countywide												Х
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	Storymaps.arcgis.com Richardson bay resilience SLR projections and interactive map	Enviro Hazard							Х					
R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)	Fairfax is a terrible place to do massive development. SFD blvd is slammed with all kinds of traffic. Local and tourist traffic. Pt. Reyes, Olema, Stinson, MMWD all get millions of visitors a year- all of which travel on SFD.	Countywide				х								
R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)	More senior housing is needed and they would not add to the traffic congestion on Sir Francis Drake in the AM & PM peak traffic times.	Countywide												Х
R22 - 2400 Sir Francis Drake Drive (Unincorporated Fairfax)	Prefer other housing closer to the highway/commuting corridor and closer to the city for shorter commute to jobs.	Countywide			Х									
R3 - 275 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Prefer more density in other locations that are closer to the city.	Countywide			х	х	х							
R4 - 5600 Nicasio Valley Road (Nicasio)	There are lots of agricultural workers in West Marin who would benefit from affordable housing in Nicasio.	Countywide												Х
R5 - 299 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	This location is not within walking distance or near any public transit including bus stops, grocery store, gas station, or any amenities. Recommend to instead build more housing near those amenities and public transit. It is also farthest away from most of the jobs people commute to in the city or East Bay, so will increase commute times and congestion due to lack of being near any public transit. Density in other locations closer to the city is preferred.	Countywide			Х	х	x							
R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)	Density closer to the city as in this location is preferred. Along the highway/commuter corridor is a plus as well.	Countywide												Х
R6 - Donahue Street (Marin City)	Placing additional units here wouldn't be in line with the "Address Racial Equity and Historic Patterns of Segregation" Scenario because there is already a majority of publis housing and low income units in Marin City	Equity											х	
	·						 							

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA BALANCING	C ACT CODI	 J14										
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	"The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7."	Countywide		x			Х			Х			
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Eagle Rock is already pretty well built-out. The ability to turn off of the main intersection here is already hotly contested. This would be more cars with the inability to turn to go home. Do not feed us all the line that people who live here will not have cars and will only use public transportation. That never turns out to be the case.	Countywide		x	х								
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Incredibly steep terrain; no room for 32 units; no water hook-up, access or other infrastructure, which could lead to neighborhood evacuation problems in a fire-prone area; already bad traffic on tiburon boulevard; abundant wildlife with nowhere to go if you destroy their habitat	,	х	Х			х	Х		x	х		
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Prefer more housing in locations like this closer to the city - where jobs are - to shorten commutes and decrease traffic sprawl. Also like that this site is closer to the highway/commuting corridor.	Countywide											Х
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	This is pristine natural land with an abundance of local species of wildlife.	Countywide						Х					
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	This is the next street over from me as I live in Kruger Pines 47 N Knoll Road- we would need a traffic light put at N Knoll Rd & Tiburon Blvd redo that intersection and make N Knoll Road a county maintained road too as it is just pot holes now and getting worse. The traffic has to be very aggressive leaving the neighborhood to make a right turn to get on the 101. There is no way to make left turns at all onto Tiburon Blvd. so that whole intersection needs to be redone. It could be family and workforce up on Eagle Rock and put the seniors on N. Knoll Road.	Countywide		Х								x	х
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	This site is not appropriate for high density housing. The Eagle Rock neighborhood already has traffic problems, and adding units will exacerbate those issues. This particular site is on extreme slope - likely a 30% grade. Adding high density housing to this site will also destroy the family neighborhood surrounded by open space. Please consider repurposing more urban locations.	Countywide		Х			х	Х					
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	Traffic is horrible in this area. Also there is a lot of street parking on Eagle Rock. Adding additional housing will only cause worse conditions. The open space on ring mountain is home to many wildlife (owls, coyotes, turkey, deer and bobcats not to mention smaller animals as well.)	Countywide		Х	х		х	х					
R8 - 8901 Redwood Boulevard (North Novato)	Fire risk and lack of water for more residents. This appears to be over a state park. No development on a state park.	Countywide						Х		Х	Х		
R8 - 8901 Redwood Boulevard (North Novato)	Prefer more building down south near the city/jobs, for shorter commutes, less traffic, and less sprawl.	Countywide		Х				Х					
R8 - 8901 Redwood Boulevard (North Novato)	Too close to important Miwok site.	Enviro Hazard		Х					Х				
R9 - Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Quentin)	l raffic to get to the bridge is already terrible. Reroute the road going to the bridge and this would be a good location.	Countywide		Х									
Total RHNA Allocation	This is far too much that is being shoved down into the funnel where there is little land available (Strawberry, Marin City). The County needs to be aggressive and pushing back on ABAG and the state. San Francisco has over 40,000 vacant properties so let Weiner deal with getting San Francisco vacancies down and stop shoving the issue onto Marin.	Countywide											

·	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	, ,				1			1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
1009 Idleberry (Lucas Valley/Marinwood)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		х	x	х								Х				
Valloy/Marinwood)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		Х	x	x								х				
223 Shoreline HIghway (Tam Junction)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the uniquee characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the innertory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	X	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
223 Shoreline HIghway (Tam Junction)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	X	x	X		x		x	x	x	x	x	×	×		
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		x	×					x							×	
254 Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Where is this? Where the stable is now located?	Email																

In sixting this approximaty as a moleterial Upper Lucras Valley in Nation Valve or previous previous about the housing ables under consideration in my area. In general lacent forces what constitution and control of the previous and the provided and appears and the provided and and appears and the provided and appears and appears and the provided and appears and the provided and appears and appears and the provided and		COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL								1		l	ı						$\overline{}$
general: Edent increase hat constanted emotion is bor income, but is general support add the business private groups and securities of the Spatial register in an absolute of communication of the securities and additional communication of the securities of the Spatial and available to these vortices. Seek suiting more high-priced rental units server no one but properly owners. Silses under consideration in the Mariness (Long Andrews Spatial Sp	Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feetback below. 1: Ensure  Terra Linda Ridge  254 Lucas Valley Road near  Terra Linda Ridge  This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in unincorporated Marin St Uncertainally double to the population of this area, affecting all services -sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS  VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marins St Uncertainally double out in the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure  254 Lucas Valley Road near  Terra Linda Ridge  This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure  254 Lucas Valley Road near  Terra Linda Ridge  This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the Color board of the proposed of the support of the supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure  254 Lucas Valley Road near  Terra Linda Ridge  This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood Area to a support to the proposed to the proposed of the proposed to some moderate increase of housing united and part over the Vite Lacas Valley V Marinwood Area currently has less than rough	,	general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'I housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy scess to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters),530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I wouldn't be adverse to seeing a portion of the current 7 Mt. Lassen structures converted to workfilive spaces, if sensitively planned. Maybe 30%. My comments re: St. V	Email	х		х	х		x	x			х		x			x	x
expansion, the amount proposed by the county is o werwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LLCAS Nature 1 and a requitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LLCAS VALLEY rate is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lasssen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Adhrear terra Linda Ridge; 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)  We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136,503 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32  7, Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 56, 23 Jeannette Prand Way (site of Juvenivood Market - 136,503 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32  National Community of Marinwood Allocas Valley Administration of the Association of the		expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing	Email		x	x	x				x				×				
by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 86% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Voicent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market – 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3,5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in this area. (3) The site at 530 Blackstone Drive (current site of religious house) could easily fit a multi-unit development, however 32 to the other of the area	•	expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing	Email		x	x	x				x				X				
Terra Linda Ridge  housing units. (4) The site at 7 Mt. Lassen Drive (currently two relatively small two-story office buildings) is far too small to fit 58 housing units without the new structure extending to three or more stories. (5) The site at 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (south of the Juvenile Hall) is currently an open space area with a loop path that is regularly used by nearby residents (including residents of the nearby senior housing development) as a recreational walking, bike riding, etc. area (and dog walking area). This open space area has been in existence for well over thirty years and is a very popular area regularly used by many residents of the adjoining neighborhoods. A potential development consisting of 254 units on this site would completely eliminate a treasured and much-used open space area and would likely require a multi-story (three or more stories) structure. Very few of the homes in this area of Lucas Valley / Marinwood are more than one story (almost all are one-story Eichler homes). Such a large development is completely out of character with the current land use in this area and should absolutely not be allowed to be developed on this site. (6) These potential new housing units would overwhelm the current capacity at our three elementary schools and one middle school. (8) These potential new housing units would create a very large additional burden to be developed on the current land use in this area and should should be a very large and would read to a very large additional burden to traffic density in the area. (7) These potential new housing units would create a very large additional burden to large and would represent an approximate doubling of the current housing density in the area. Each of the proposed developments presents issues regarding the size of new structures (including constructing multi-story structures in areas where there are currently none), and would present issues concerning current resource capacities (including traffic, schools, and water). Thank you for your c	Terra Linda Ridge	by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley/ Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School -1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in this area. (3) The site at 530 Blackstone Drive (current site of religious house) could easily be for more stories units as currently exist anywhere in this area. (5) The site at 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (south of the Juvenile Hall) is currently has less than 50 total housing units. (4) The site at 7 Mt. Lassen Drive	Email			х	х				x		x			x			
2800 West Novato Blvd., Novato Blvd., If you need MORE "VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME" and "MODERATE INCOME" sites closer to Novato, our property at 2800 West Novato Blvd has plenty of room and space. Thank you. We appreciate all your hard work here	,		Email																Х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1						1	1	1		1					
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
4260 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Woodacre	Hello Supervisor Rodoni, This message is regarding the Housing Element site proposals. Like yourself, I was born and raised in West Marin County. My family has been ranching in Marin for 5 generations, and our love for the land and community runs deep. We understand that there is a need for more affordable housing in Marin, however; We oppose any development at 4260 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (TUHS). Development on said property would be a detriment to the Valley consider how the lack of public transportation, water access, septic/sewage and the increase of traffic would impact the surrounding area - community, environment and wildlife as a whole. There are many other places in Marin where housing can be developed and integrated into the surrounding area to the benefit of the community. We are asking you to conserve the land at 4260 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. Thank you for your time.	Email				x		x				x		X	X			
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transpation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential home building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road /M thuir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4. 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer. High Wildfire Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aeathetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in mo	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		x		x				x		×	x	×	×		×	
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		x	x					х							×	
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley: 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 ???	Email																
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	х				х				x				
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	х				х				X				

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
530 Blackstone Drive (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley I Aminimood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current buildings in this area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures. Which do not currently exist anywhere in this are	Email			х	х				x		x			x			
6 Jeanette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		x	x	x								x				
6900 Sir Francis Drive Boulevard (San Geronino)	I could not access the Balancing Site work area so I am submitting these comments here. SGV is am amazing place to be due to low development. I have had the benefit of living here 25 years. What is being proposed in both of the areas of the School property and at the Gold Course are for higher end homes. Higher end homes are not a help for our community. We need homes for families with kids, We need Senior housing. We don't need another 127 above moderate income homes. Have some vision. Create a place with a grocery store, deli, and place for people to meet. Create Senior housing. Have ability to share vehicles. This area could become a hub for our community to use and support. It is also a sensitive environmental area. It used to be where water would spread out when it rained and slowly sink into the ground providing water all year round for the fish. More concrete and asphalt = more runoff. This vision of 98 separate high end homes here is not fitting to the rural area of our valley. It is just going to bring in more people who want a rural lifestyle from other areas and NOT give our locals homes. Every day, people, and families are looking for homes. Renters are being pushed out. It is unaffordable to live here. Solve the problem we have now, housing for our locals. Not bring more people here. Also, the place being considered at 6900 Sir Francis Drake is a privately owned place. Owned by a family that owns quite a bit of property in the Valley as it is. I certainly hope public monies are not going to rehab this property.	Email								x		Х					х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transpation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential house building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Leanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4. 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer. High Wildfirer Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		X		x				x		x	x	x	x		x	
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		х	х	х								Х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development is the sare within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		x	x					x							×	
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58: Would this replace office park? If so 58 apartments or condos seems reasonable. No market rate	Email															Х	х
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site, 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall)	Email	×		х	x		x	x			x		x			x	x
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1					1	1	1						-	-		
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	x				х				х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	х	х				x				х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvi/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact evacuation routes out of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvii/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact evacuation routes out of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				Х				
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAC (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Adhear terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of \$t. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would leasily be developed there, or the size of the property, which is near the end of a small half-mile				x	х				x		×			x			
7 Mt. Lassen (Marinwood / Lucas Valley)	With respect to the Lucas Valley sites being considered as potential housing sites, I submit the following comments: Sites located at 7 Mt. Lassen Drive and at Lucas Valley Road/Mt Muir near Terra Linda Ridge fail to comply with stated criteria for site selection. These sites present environmental hazards, including high fire danger as exhibited last August when a wildire approached housing and traffic became a hazard. These areas also fail to provide access to transportation, jobs, services, and amentities. Lucas Valley is an inappropriate choice. In addition, all of the Lucas Valley sites are in the wildland urban interface (WUI) zones that contradict Governor Newson's priorities to shift housing away from rural wildfire-prone areas and closer to urban centers.	Email	х			x		х		х		х		х				
70 Oxford Drive, Santa Venetia	RE: APN 180-261-10 Address: 70 Oxford Drive. The undersigned is owner of this large (27.8 acres, or approx. 1,211,000 sf) parcel. As currently zoned A2B2 (minimum lot size of 10,000 sf), it is extraordinarily and technically suitable for numerous residences. To help the County and the State to meet their Housing target, we agree with and welcome the proposed suggestion of multiple possible residences on this acreage, but suggest the number be reduced to a maximum of five (5). This necessarily lower number would result in (A) lot sizes more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, as specifically recommended in the Santa Venetia Community Plan; (B) smaller homes consistent with the affordability targets; (C) lot configurations more accessible (requiring less ground disturbance) and least likely to conflict with numerous environmental and cultural constraints extant on the site; and (D) a density nearly ten times less than the initial proposal, thus significantly less negative impact on the current traffic congestion on NSPR which is the sole access/egress to Santa Venetia.	Email	х			x				х		x						

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lillness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	х			x					x	x		x			x	
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	[Comment edited for length] Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" of Local Roadways: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	х	x		х		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	T																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's Elfa and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		X	x	x	х		x		х	×	x	x	x	x	x		
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					х			х				
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. Given the County's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Bilithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the ned for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative Investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of	Email																
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	х	х	х	х		х		х	х	х	х	х	х	х		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1	1	1	1	1 1		1	1		1	,					
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingo Rd. he site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than pr	Email				x		×			×							
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				Х					Х			Х				
B - 160 Shoreline Highway (Almonte)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodriguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)-that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				x					х	х						
Bon Air Shopping Center (Greenbrae)	you should add this is your list of housing element sites. This land could accommodate many units, it is very close to public transportation and have plenty of available parking.	Email																х
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	(Comment edited for length) The homeowners and residents of Los Ranchitos (LR) strongly believe that re-zoning LR for denser housing in inappropriate and short-sighted and strongly oppose this change. As you prepare the Housing Element for 2023-30, please take the following into consideration: 1. Incorrect categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." As a neighborhood, and in terms of its past and current deeds, land use and zoning designations, LR is fully built out. LR was founded and developed on the basis of one (1) single family dwelling per parcel, with the minimum parcel size of 1 acre. For this reason alone, rezoning is undesirable to the property owners. There are few if any unbuilt lots, and the few that may exist are highly sloped properties up steep, one-lane streets, likely private roads maintained by the property owners themselves, not by the County. These are wholly inappropriate for multi-family development. 2. Arbitrary categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." Not all the properties in LR are highlighted in the map. The assignment of properties as "underutilized residential" on the basis of property improvements is inconsistent and incorrect. Many properties that have been extensively remodeled are incorrectly designated as "underutilized." Many properties that have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties hat have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties hat have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties hat have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized." Many properties have not seen maintained and are being lived in and enjoyed mainly by owners in residence. The high land to improvements ratio most likely results less from remodeling than from continuous, long-term property ownership under Proposition 13. Since many properties have not changed hands in recent years or even	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 64-74)	x	x		x				x		x		х	X			

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTP	ACT	NMP	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	(Comment edited for length) The homeowners and residents of Los Ranchitos (LR) strongly believe that re-zoning LR for denser housing in inappropriate and short-sighted and strongly oppose this change. As you prepare the Housing Element for 2023-30, please take the following into consideration: 1. Incorrect categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." As a neighborhood, and in terms of its past and current deeds, land use and zoning designations, LR is fully built out. LR was founded and developed on the basis of one (1) single family dwelling per parcel, with the minimum parcel size of 1 acre. For this reason alone, rezoning is undesirable to the property owners. There are few if any unbuilt lots, and the few that may exist are highly sloped properties up stepe, one-lane streets, likely private roads maintained by the property owners themselves, not by the County. These are wholly inappropriate for multi- family development.2. Arbitrary categorization of parcels as "underutilized residential." Not all the properties in LR are highlighted in the map. The assignment of properties as "underutilized residential" on the basis of property improvements is inconsistent and incorrect. Many properties that have been extensively remodeled are incorrectly designated as "underutilized." Many properties that have not been remodeled are not designated as "underutilized," when under the County's own definition, they should be. These designations are arbitrary and inconsistent, with reality. 3. Incorrect Improvement-to-land ratios on property tax records. We disagree with the County's assessment of LR properties as "underutilized residential" according to the definition presented. Properties in LR have been maintained and are being lived in and enjoyed mainly by owners in residence. The high land to improvements ratio most likely results less from remodeling than from continuous, long-term property ownership under Propertion 13. Since many properties have not changed hands in recent years or even decades, or are pa		x	x		x				x		X		x	x			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	I am writing in response to the 2023-2030 Housing Element Proposals for the Los Ranchitos area of Marin County. The current proposal for approximately 139 additional units in Los Ranchitos does not consider the safety of residents and the impact on the natural environment. 1. Los Ranchitos is made up of lots on narrow hillside streets, without sidewalks and street lights. Adding more units will increase the difficulty of fighting fires on the upper streets or safely evacuating residents when earthquakes occur. 2. The only way in and out of Los Ranchitos is on Los Ranchitos Road. Traffic on Los Ranchitos Road becomes gridlock today when there is the slightest slowdown on Highway 101. I expect traffic will increase as the proposed housing units in the Northgate Mall are built. Adding more units in Los Ranchitos will make that even worse. 3. Where will the water come from for all of these proposed additional housing units, including the ones outside of Los Ranchitos? We are all reducing water usage to meet current water restrictions. I would think new sources of water should be identified and funded before large scale housing increases are proposed. 4. Los Ranchitos lots were created and deeded to be 1 acre minimum parcels. We are zoned light agricultural, resulting in many barnyard animals and backyard vegetable gardens. The rural nature of this area is what attracted me to this area and I am sure that is true for most of my neighbors. As I noted above, many of our streets are on steep hills. So to get 139 additional units in Los Ranchitos zoning will be changed to allow apartment-like buildings on the flatter streets. This will destroy the rural/wildlife feel to this neighborhood.	Email		x		x			х	х		х		х	х			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	I find it hard to believe that this many new housing units is even being considered! For the last three years we've been told that we can use only 60 gallons of water a day. And you want to add 1000 more houses in Los Ranchitos? Where does the water come from? Traffic is already insane, and this will add nothing but more gridlock. What about the fire hazards in densely populated areas? I find it absolutely insane that this could even be in anybody's minds. The people that live in this area chose it because of the zoning and the lot sizes. How can you just swoop in and say the "hell with you we're going to do what we want"? What happened to private property rights?	Email				x				x				х	х			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	I write to express my great objections to the proposed housing element to rezone Los Ranchitos in unincorporated Marin County. It is not well thought out and will have many negative consequences. First, the infrastructure of water, fire protection, education do not support this proposal. Due to the hilly properties and limited egress/ingress greater density will create a major fire liability and risk. Already, only one insurer will write policies for this neighborhood. Second, Los Ranchitos lots were created and deeded to be 1 acre minimum parcels for single family housing. Increasing density here will destroy the rural nature of our neighborhood. Third, Los Ranchitos is a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). In addition to increased fire hazard, it will greatly affect the native animal habitats of turkeys, owls, deer, foxes and other animals. Fourth, The only way into and out of Los Ranchitos is Los Ranchitos Road. That road is already gridlocked during morning rush hours. The addition of more new housing units in Northgate and Terra Linda will greatly exacerbate traffic and gridlock under normal circumstances, and create a huge potential for loss of life in the event of major emergencies like fires and earthquakes. Adding housing to Los Ranchitos will only make a bad situation worse. Fifth, Los Ranchitos is currently zoned agricultural with numerous barnyard animals kept here. Increased density will adversely affect them as well. This housing element is not well thought out and will be detrimental to health and safety as outlined above. I urge that this plan not be adopted.	Email				х				х		х		х				

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	80,	DC!	INT	SER	TDF	חסיי	ртр	ACT	NINAD	CE A	NAT	CI	EIP	\A/A+	шт	EQ	GD!
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	lwrite to express my objections to proposals in the County's Housing Element to rezone the Los Ranchitos area of unincorporated Marin County. While I acknowledge the need for additional housing, and generally support efforts to equitably provide for the good of the greater community, I believe that the proposal to rezone this particular area of the County is misguided. For one thing, the only way into and out of Los Ranchitos is Los Ranchitos Road. As things currently stand, Los Ranchitos is already a very congested road, used as the primary corridor through which people access the Northgate malls, Terra Linda High, Mark Day School and other points west of Highway 101 and in the valley between Central San Rafael and Lucas Valley. Los Ranchitos Road is already becoming a dangerous thoroughfare, particularly at the two Los Ranchitos Road/Circle Road intersections. The planned redevelopment of the Northgate Mall (up to 1,443 residential units, I understand?) is going to put even more pressure pressure on Los Ranchitos Road. The addition of another 80-139 more units in the Los Ranchitos neighbor is going to push things over the edge. Heavy traffic and gridlock will be normal circumstances - a nuisance on a daily basis, but a real safety hazard in the event of a significant emergency or disaster, such as an earthquake or fire. Further, as a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) area, the Los Ranchitos area already poses a significant risk (so much so that at least one insurer that I'm aware or already refuses to provide coverage to residents of the area). With greater density between them and the only road out, all residents of Los Ranchitos, but particularly this in the hilly portions of the neighborhood (the majority of the current residents) will face a real and life threatening challenge should a wildfire or other disaster strike. Greater density in this WUI will also have an adverse, if not existential, impact on turkey, owl, deer, fox and other animal populations that call the area home. The plan to rezone Los Ranchi	Email		x	x	x			х			х		х	x			
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Like many Los Ranchitos residents my wife and I both feel very strongly that we do not think additional development in our agricultural neighborhood is wise. Denser housing will destroy the area, cause additional traffic, eliminate much of the animal friendly atmosphere and potentially be significantly difficult for fire engines and other ingress and egress. Please reconsider and hopefully leave our area the beautiful place that we love.	Email				х				х		х		х				
D - Los Ranchitos Road (Los Ranchitos)	Los Ranchitos Housing Element Sites: I would like to comment about the upcoming Housing Element environmental review. I do not believe that there is infrastructure regarding Safety Elements and Water supply. Our driveways is 8 feet wide up a steep knoll. It is not conducive to adding density housing. The past two years drought, is an indication that we do not have enough rain to sustain our community. If we are to add more housing it will increase water usage. What will happen to the community if the water is not available. Regarding the infrastructure, the roads will need to be addressed. The safety will be more dangerous for emergency vehicles if the roads are full of traffic on two lane roads. Thank you for considering my comments to the environmental review	Email		X		х								х	х			
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential home building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3 - 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, incling amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors include: High Wildfirer Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect brighy influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		×		x				×		x	x	x	x		x	
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I am concerned since I never received this notice. I learned about it from one neighbor on Thursday 2/24. How were property owners in this area notified? How many homeowners have you contacted. I don't know any who has been notified except the neighbor that told me. Please give me the courtesy of a response. This is a lovely area but with many limitations & constraints for development – infrastructure limited ingress & egress on Lucas Valley Road schools etc. Additionally this is a WUI wildfire area. A recent minor fire caused limited area evacuations. I was evacuated and this small event caused alarming road congestion. In case of a more extensive fire it would be a disaster.	Email		Х	х	х								x				

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NATO	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email	PUL	X	X	IKF	PKK	PIK	ACI	X	SEA	INAI	COL	FIK	vvA1	nL1	X	GDL
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley.2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) - 254 100 or less Good location but too many units, must be affordable. Rotary Senior Housing is excellent. Perhaps expand affordable housing for seniors there with larger 2 BR units	Email															х	х
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. I'm not opposed to additional housing, but it should be done gradually and incrementally. I'm concerned about the number of units planned for Jeanette Prandi/Juvi of 254 units. That, I, believe, is WAY more than Rotary Village. It is one thing if it is planned as beautifully as Rotary Village with one-story facilities and have trees and landscaping. It is another thing if you build a 4 story building in the center of the meadow of Marin County Parks.	Email								х		х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive; part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters).530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I wouldn	Email			x	х		x	x			×		x			x	×
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	my wife and I are long time residents of Lucas Valley and most every day we visit and walk in the delightful redwood lined area in front of Juvi. It is with shock and utter disappointment that I see that this site is being considered for additional apartment housing. In case u have not noticed the traffic on Lucas Valley road is already quite bad especially when inevitably get stopped at the new light on Los Gamos. If this new housing is approved the addI vehicles on the road will be intolerable Each new resident will need a car as there is NO reliable public transportation. Would make more sense to be built much closer to hwy 101 Please do NOT approve this thoughtless proposal	Email				х		х				х						
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	my wife and I are long time residents of Lucas Valley and most every day we visit and walk in the delightful redwood lined area in front of Juvi. It is with shock and utter disappointment that I see that this site is being considered for additional apartment housing. In case u have not noticed the traffic on Lucas Valley road is already quite bad especially when inevitably get stopped at the new light on Los Gamos. If this new housing is approved the addI vehicles on the road will be intolerable Each new resident will need a car as there is NO reliable public transportation. Would make more sense to be built much closer to hwy 101 Please do NOT approve this thoughtless proposal	Email				х		x										
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house); 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/Inear terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email ;		х	x	x				x				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandil/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	x	х				х				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Juvi/Jeanette Prandi currently has low income senior housing. An expansion of this senior housing would be good use of this area and needed in the community. Multistory housing/254 units on this small property does not fit in with this area of single family homes and the surrounding openspace and can not be supported by current transportation structure and schools.	Email		х	х	х				х							х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Juvi/Jeanette Prandi currently has low income senior housing. An expansion of this senior housing would be good use of this area and needed in the community. Multistory housing/254 units on this small property does not fit in with this area of single family homes and the surrounding openspace and can not be supported by current transportation structure and schools.	Email		х	x	х				х							х	
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvi/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact to use to use the value of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				х				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 4: Consider Environmental Hazards: Juvi/Jeanette Prandi & Mt Lassen housing expansion would impact LUCAS VALLEY Road traffic, especially during school /work commutes and also impact evacuation routes out of the valley. This road is also heavily used by bikers/cars en route to west marin.	Email				х				x				х				
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge; 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valle				×	×				×		X			x			
E - 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (Lucas Valley)	With respect to the Lucas Valley sites being considered as potential housing sites, I submit the following comments: Juvenile Hall Site Master Plan (A copy of the Master Plan and Appendix will be presented to the Board of Supervisors at the March 2, 2021 meeting.): A Master Plan was developed through collaboration of Marin County Supervisor Bob Roumiguiere, Planning Director Mark Reisenfeld, and Lucas Valley Community members. The Master Plan was submitted to the Board of Supervisors and adopted in 1994. The Plan encompasses the Jeanette Prandi and Juvenile Hall sites being considered as housing sites. The Master Plan provides: a. Upper Idylberry Corridor - The plan stipulates the area north of the Idylberry is transferred to the Open Space District, and there shall be no structures or other improvements north of the Idylberry Corridor. b. Lower SE portion of the Juvenile Hall Site - the lower grass area is preserved for recreational uses. c. SW corner of the site (Jeanette Prandi Way) - shall remain as County Administrative and Storage Facilities only. d. Rotary Senior Housing (Jeanette Prandi Way) - shall be limited to 55 units, single story only. e. Juvenile Hall and County Parks Offices - area shall remain as County facilities. No additional development is permitted. The restrictions of the Master Plan prohibit consideration of this entire area for possible housing sites. In addition, all of the Lucas Valley sites are in the wildland urban interface (WUI) zones that contradict Governor Newson's priorities to shift housing away from rural wildlfre-prone areas and closer to urban centers.	Email								х		X		х				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		1		1		1				1		- 1			- 1		$\neg$
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley Alley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential housing sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2. Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4. 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new buildings sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer: High Wildfire Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)											x					×
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I am writing to urge you NOT to approve the Marinwood/Lucas Valley sites under consideration to satisfy the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan. Developments at these six sites (St. Vincent's School, Marinwood Market, 530 Blackstone Drive, 7 Mt. Lassen, 2 Jeannette Prandi Way, and Lucas Valley Road near Terra Linda Ridge) would result in more than 2300 housing units. While I know that some of the proposed housing is intended for teachers and other critical workers and for low income housing, both of which are important and necessary, it seems like too much development for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		×	х					x							×	
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. Marinwood Market - 136 100 or less: Best and necessary site for redevelopment, but it should be a mixed use development as was proposed by Bridge Housing some years ago. Housing number should be reduced to under 100	Email								х								
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I hope that the Marinwood Plaza/market site is again under consideration for housing. As you most likely know, some 15 years or so ago, the community shot down an excellent proposal from Bridge Housing. Except for the market, the property remains a derelict eyesore. Many of us in Marinwood would like to see the property improved, including a modest amount of housing development, along with community amenities such as a coffee shop, brew pub, or other gathering place, and other shops such as hair salon, co-working space, etc. It is close to public transportation, schools, and major employers most notably Kaiser. It's a far superior site for development than the St Vincents property which has myriad sea level rise and other environmental challenges, and very little other infrastructure. I hope the property will be on be on tomorrow's meeting agenda.	Email																х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. Then two of the sites are still contaminated from the former cleaners at Marinwood Market Plaza - St. Vincent's and Marinwood Market Plaza. So what happens with the housing planned in these locations?1936 units?	Email														Х		
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general! support add't housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, shertiff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fwy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Trai tation. And/or a shuttle but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart Trai station. And/or a shuttle but spirits of one to walk for commuters).530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However,	Email			×	х		X	x			×		×			x	x

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1								_		_	,					
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	The 2022 Marin County Candidates site for Unincorporated Marin and especially Marinwood/ Lucas Valley/Silveria Ranch is absurd. It targets just 5 square miles with 80% of the housing allocation for affordable housing in one community WITHOUT essential planning for schools, roads, government services, water, sewer and other essential services. Why "plan to fail"? Shouldn't a good faith effort to build affordable housing in our community also include a comprehensive plan for accommodating growth? It doesn't. This is why it should be rejected today. Instead, let's address the core questions for growth AND the financial impact of adding massive amount of largely non profit housing to a single community WITHOUT ADDITIONAL TAX BASE. Marinwood/Lucas Valley currently has approximately 2700 housing units for 6000 residents. The proposed housing sites could add 2300 apartments and 5500 residents who ALL WILL NEED schools, water, government services, transportation, access to shopping, etc. Shouldn't a proper plan for growth precede approval for housing? One of the sites listed is Marinwood Plaza, our communities ONLY commercial plaza within walking distance for thousands of fresidents. If the plan for 160 units is approved, this would squeeze out a vital community center to the detriment of all. This is not including the problem of TOXIC WASTE contamination clean up suitable for residential dwelling is a long way off despite community pressure on the Regional Water Quality Control Board who will not enforce its own clean up orders on the current owners. Despite the harsh criticism of the RHNA process, I believe there is a real community desire for more affordable housing in a community that will be planned appropriately, won't redevelop our neighborhoods and utilize open spaces like Silveira Ranch, St Vincents and other sites. While everyone I know supports the idea of more housing, not a single one wants a poorly conceived plan that forces large housing projects without considering the impacts. Reject the current RHNA p	Email		×	×					х		х				x		
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house); 32 Mt Lassen/delic 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi 254 Lucas Vallep Rd/near terra Linda (290: 26 Total: 2306. Cfhis could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				x				x				
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				х				х				
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Marinwood market area has been talked about for years as a good site for housing units because of access to 101, market, etc. and is a good location for expansion of housing-it is also close to public transportation.	Email																х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; Marinwood market area has been talked about for years as a good site for housing units because of access to 101, market, etc. and is a good location for expansion of housing- it is also close to public transportation.	Email																х
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School -1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,412 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in this				x	×				x		х			x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	,						1									
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
G - 155 Marinwood Avenue (Marinwood)	While I am generally in favor of additional low-income housing in Marin, it appears that the proposals for development of Marinwood Avenue turn that are of our neighborhoods (I live across the street) into an area that exclusively low-income housing. Experiments with consolidating low-income housing in the 1960-80's proved to us that this does not work well. These areas become neglected bygovernment and residents alike. Is it possible to make these development more diverse?	Email															х	
	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Future Housing Sites in Marin County. I attended the local Housing meeting regarding Santa Venetia and Los Ranchitos on February 15th and live in the Santa Venetia area. Here are my comments from a Santa Venetia resident perspective: 1. The process, while advised by the Marin County Planning Department, is being run by a consulting agency that is not familiar with Marin County and the local areas & neighborhoods. 2. The number of assigned housing units to Santa Venetia, 422, ignores the following. Before housing site numbers are assigned and accepted, a "CEQA-lite" analysis should be performed to determine if the numbers and locations are practical from a CEQA perspective. We heard these concerns brushed off with the response that if any development is going to be done, a full CEQA would be completed before development could/would proceed. This would be an "after-the-fact" process, with the fact that the housing numbers and sites have already been assigned and accepted, and would be too late to be influential in the development process. a. There is only one practical vehicle road out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by three schools, the one at the JCC, the Marin School, and Venetia Valley school, and a large pre-school. Traffic in & out of Santa Venetia is also already heavily impacted by the JCC, the Civic Center traffic, the Marin Lagoon traffic, the Veterans Memorial traffic, the Marin Lagoon Housing and the commercial enterprises along McInnis Parkway. b. Some of the sites selected are in wetlands areas, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road, c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road, c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site, d. The total number of housing units assigned to Marin County,					x				x				x	×			
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	Here in Santa Venetia, we are living with water shortages, traffic congestion, and our community's evacuation route was named the most dangerous in Marin and yet huge additional numbers of housing are proposed for this flood prone neighborhood. That's insanel We are not fooled by claims that these new residents won't drive everywhere. They will. We already know that every person of driving age in our neighborhood not only drives but owns a car, or truck. They line our streets, further restricting access routes. There are sites where housing can happen like at Northgate Mall, but not in our overcrowded flood zone.	Email				x				x	х			х				
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa	Hi, I would like to object to 251 N San Pedro as a site to build housing. There is a Child Center there serving many families. The ball field on the property is used by the children at the school and people in the neighborhood. There are very few ball fields for Little League. This ball field should not be taken away from ball players. I live in the condo complex next door. Parking is already limited for residents and guests. We can't absorb all the people people who would live there who have more cars then the give spots for them and their guests. If housing needs to be built in Santa Venetia why not 1565 Vendola Dr? The school property there has not been used for decades.	Email																х
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I am a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia, yet the Housing Element recommends 422 additional units, representing an increase of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural well as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at severe risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received a \$	Email				×				x	x			x	x		x	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I am a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with uity traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia, yet the Housing Element recommends 422 additional units, representing an increase of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural as well as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at severe risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received	Email		x		x				×	x	x	×	x	x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1												, ,				
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I am against the proposed units on North San Pedro Road. This proposed project is completely unsustainable and not researched for undesirable living situations. There are many factors that indicate this would not be a good site to build. Factors such as flood control, sea rising at a rate we can expect in the coming years, congestion, removal of a ball park and mostly there are no services to support this project. Well thought out projects include parks, services, bike paths, sidewalks and a reasonable egress in case of fire. North San Pedro Road is all ready congested due to a large school and many churches on this road. Another road to San Rafael is available to Point San Pedro Road however this road is failing due to floods in the winter and very evident sink holes that are not being addressed. More traffic would of course erode the roads further and in the past have had slides on this road particularly after recent tree removal has increased the likely occurance.	Email		х	х	x				х	х	х		х				
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I attended the zoom meeting a few nights ago. I share the concern of some of my neighbors, well articulated by Gina Hagen. While I totally support affordable housing (so question if this will be "affordable" for working class people), I think we already have too many high density buildings on San Pedro Road, Jcc, school, rest homes, elder affordable housing, civic center etc So I would support maybe 25 more units or something manageable, but hundreds seems like asking for trouble in an emergency. I live on Labrea way and I am glad we have housing for families, down the street, but a common problem is the amount of cars and high occupancy of some of the apartments. The overflow of cars goes all the way to Rosal, and currently I have had cars parked in front of my house for a month and more. It is not a significant problem in my case, but my neighbor who has teenagers with cars, is having to struggle to park their own cars, while the overflow is from housing two blocks away. Obviously San Rafael is a good place for more housing and i would think a place closer to the freeway like Marin Square could be used for extra units of housing. I also would personally like to build an accessory unit in my front yard for a student, teacher, medical professional, at affordable rate. It would be nice to have a department in Marin county who could help seniors like myself design,, get permits, and loans to afford to create such units. I myself was a renter in Marin for 36 years and lived in in-law apartments. I found it much more private and a win/win solution for the owner, typically older retired person, and myself as young professional. I was excited about an organization called Lily Pads and attended a meeting but found out later the owner was no longer providing services. So this would be a great thing to promote. Thank you for including us in your work. Hope we can have more affordable housing, while preserving the safety of our neighborhoods.	Email					×			х							x	
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I served on the Santa Venetia Community Plan (SVCP) Committee for almost 10 years, including working with County Staff the last 4 years, until its final adoption in 2017. This process included a thorough survey of our neighbors who commented on every empty parcel and open space for future development (and in fact Godbe told us the response was overwhelming with a higher than normal percentage of participation). Our SVCP Committee Members represented every corner of Santa Venetia. We held community meetings (that were well-attended) so I residents had a chance to voice their opinions and ideas. No one knows Santa Venetia better than Santa Venetians. The plan was supposed to cover everything of interest to ensure a diverse, family-oriented, and happy community for years to come. Adding 442 units is simply untenable for a small, working-class hamlet such as Santa Venetia. The last two open spaces (two ball fields) are slated for high density housing. This is totally uncharacteristic of the surrounding neighbors who live in small, single-family housing. In the February 15th Housing Element Zoom call, with County Staff and Contractors from who knows where?, we were informed that our Community Plan would need to be updated. Who would do this work? When and how soon would these updates happen? How can the County randomly update our Community Plans that we spent so many resources on. SB-9 and SB-10 are a complete contradiction to our Community Plan that we dedicated years of work and volunteer hours to finally see its adoption. These past summers, we've stayed inside due to smoke and/or triple-digit weather. We used a bucket from our shower to water our indoor and deck plants while our yard withered and died due to restrictions and requirements in place from Marin Water. We worked out evacuation routes to alert residents to escape danger due to our one road in and out of Santa Venetia. I heard chain saws, chippers, and weed whackers almost every day, regardless of the high, fire-danger days. This is due to San Rafae	Email									×			×	x			
H - 1565 Vendola Drive (Santa Venetia)	I will reiterate the comments I made at the February 15 Housing Element meeting I've lived in SV for over 30 years. I've served on the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association Board of Directors for almost 30 years. Through our neighborhood association, The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA), we try to get the word out so that our residents are aware of upcoming projects and opportunity to comment. We've heard from Santa Venetia residents that they want to protect our quality of life. We are already concerned about the constant fire danger, flooding, Sea Level Rise, ingress and egress, and unsafe evacuation routes. Climate change is a huge concern for us and as well, we have run out of water in Marin County and are under strict mandates, so I can't understand how adding more and more housing units will help. And to restate, 422 units in SV is an increase of almost 25% of the 1,700-1,800 units we currently had, at last count. It's a very shocking number of additional units for us. I grew up in San Rafael. I hate what they've done to the City and have been constantly disappointed with the building choices and what they have given up. I don't want to see that happening in Santa Venetia — more congestion and loss of our green spaces. Affordable housing sounds great on paper, but we never seem to get that promise fulfilled. I've followed projects in San Rafael and for almost every project, the promise is a huge amount of housing with a small portion designated affordable and then after the project passes through the hurdles, the affordable-housing number is adjusted always downward. I remember previously rules were passed to keep up with the demand of affordable housing, but the goalposts seem to constantly change and that number is lowered. What is the promise that won't happen with this process? Also, I heard them say at that meeting, they were giving schools and churches more flexibility by allowing them to build on parking lots? If that is the case, where will people park? They've already lowered	Email								×	×	х		×	×		x	

-	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL								_									
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	(Comment edited for length) As the directors of Marin Cove Homeowner's Association, and on behalf of the Association, we register our strong objections to plans to turn the Old Gallinas school site into a housing complex. The Marin Cove subdivision is in the Santa Venetia neighborhood. It has 75 units, on single lane streets, and has limited parking areas. The owners are generally single families; some of which have children. The owners, in part due to the limited public transportation, generally use cars to get to and from work. Marin Cove HOA, not the school district, owns the strip of land on the west side of Schmidt Lane separating the field at the Old Gallinas School District from Schmidt Lane. The HOA does not consent to the use of its property to provide access for proposed housing. To the extent the driveway on Schmidt Lane, which crosses the strip of property owned by the Marin Cove HOA, is claimed to be an easement to permit access to the field, if the proposed housing development contemplates the use of such driveway, such is a dramatically increased use of the easement. We do not consent to the use of the driveway to serve a 180-unit development. For the reasons discussed below, we request the removal of the Old Gallinas property from the list of sites proposed for affordable housing. We make these objections based on Government Code section 65589.21 of the Housing Crisis Act ("HCA"), which provides for denial of a proposed housing development project if such project would have a "specific, adverse environmental and social impact," as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 65589.5. A significant adverse environmental and social impact mass a "significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact" (emphasis added), based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions. (Govt. Code, § 65580.5d()(2).) Preliminarily, we object to the lack of notice of consideration of the Old Gallinas school site as a location	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 75-79)			×	x	x							x				
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	[Comment edited for length) The Northbridge Homeowners Association ("NHA") respectfully submits these initial comments regarding 251 North San Pedro Rd. (herein, "Old Gallinas School and Ball Field")—and also regarding the identified potential sites in Santa Venetia more generally. We very much appreciate the County's consideration of the below comments. Northbridge is a residential neighborhood in Santa Venetia more generally. We very much appreciate the County's consideration of the below comments. Northbridge is a residential neighborhood on and privately-cowned tennis courts. Given our close proximity to Old Gallinas School and Ball Field, any proposed development of that property is obviously of critical interest (and concern) to our residents. The County's draft candidate site list identifies Old Gallinas School and Ball Field as a candidate site for adding an extremely large number of what would have to be high-density housing units in a relatively small space. The NHA has received feedback from some of the residents in our neighborhood. The scope, size, and would-be density of this, alone, are shocking and of great concern to our neighborhood. Old Gallinas School and Ball Field would be a very poor choice/candidate for any significant housing development for multiple reasons: Please Don't Get Rid of Santa Venetia's Only Ball Field. To accommodate a project anywhere near the scope suggested in the draft list would require not only getting did of the school buildings (which themselves are currently being used for essential child day care services), but also would require getting rid of (i.e., building on top of) the baseball field which currently comprises the majority of the property. This is the only ball field that Santa Venetia formation of existing recreational assets in the community such as theexisting ball and play fields." This item was included in the Community Plan because numerous residents identified this specifically (including the Old Gallinas Ball Field, in particular) as a critical ne	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 87-89)			×	x				х		х	x	X				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																—,	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Future Housing Sites in Marin County. I attended the local Housing meeting regarding Santa Venetia and Los Ranchitos on February 15th and live in the Santa Venetia area. Here are my comments from a Santa Venetia resident perspective: 1. The process, while advised by the Marin County Planning Department, is being run by a consulting agency that is not familiar with Marin County and the local areas & neighborhoods. 2. The number of assigned housing units to Santa Venetia, 422, ignores the following. Before housing site numbers are assigned and accepted, a "CEQA-lite" analysis should be performed to determine if the numbers and locations are practical from a CEQA perspective. We heard these concerns brushed off with the response that if any development is going to be done, a full CEQA would be completed before development could/would proceed. This would be an "after-the-fact" process, with the fact that the housing numbers and sites have already been assigned and accepted, and would be too late to be influential in the development process. a. There is only one practical vehicle road out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by three schools, the one at the JCC, the Marin School, and Venetia Valley school, and a large pre-school. Traffic in & out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by the JCC, the Civic Center traffic, the Marin Lagoon traffic, the Veterans Memorial traffic, the Marin Lagoon Housing and the commercial enterprises along McInnis Parkway. b. Some of the sites selected are in wetlands areas, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road. c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road. c. Some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road by MMWD, are in the	Email				X				X				X	x			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Here in Santa Venetia, we are living with water shortages, traffic congestion, and our community's evacuation route was named the most dangerous in Marin and yet huge additional numbers of housing are proposed for this flood prone neighborhood. That's insane! We are not fooled by claims that these new residents won't drive everywhere. They will. We already know that every person of driving age in our neighborhood not only drives but owns a car, or truck. They line our streets, further restricting access routes. There are sites where housing can happen like at Northgate Mall, but not in our overcrowded flood zone.	Email				х				×	×			x				
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Hi, I would like to object to 251 N San Pedro as a site to build housing. There is a Child Center there serving many families. The ball field on the property is used by the children at the school and people in the neighborhood. There are very few ball fields for Little League. This ball field should not be taken away from ball players. I live in the condo complex next door. Parking is already limited for residents and guests. We can't absorb all the people people who would live there who have more cars then the give spots for them and their guests. If housing needs to be built in Santa Venetia why not 1565 Vendola Dr? The school property there has not been used for decades.	Email			x		х											
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I am a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia, yet the Housing Element recommends 422 additional units, representing an increase of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural swell as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at severe risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received	Email		×		×				×	×	×	×	×	×			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I am against the proposed units on North San Pedro Road. This proposed project is completely unsustainable and not researched for undesirable living situations. There are many factors that indicate this would not be a good site to build. Factors such as flood control, sea rising at a rate we can expect in the coming years, congestion, removal of a ball park and mostly there are no services to support this project. Well thought out projects include parks, services, bike paths, sidewalks and a reasonable egress in case of fire. North San Pedro Road is all ready congested due to a large school and many churches on this road. Another road to San Rafael is available to Point San Pedro Road however this road is failing due to floods in the winter and very evident sink holes that are not being addressed. More traffic would of course erode the roads further and in the past have had slides on this road particularly after recent tree removal has increased the likely occurance.	Email		x	х	х				X	х	х		х				
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I attended the zoom meeting a few nights ago. I share the concern of some of my neighbors, well articulated by Gina Hagen. While I totally support affordable housing (so question if this will be "affordable" for working class people), I think we already have too many high density buildings on San Pedro Road, Jcc, school, rest homes, elder affordable housing, civic center etc So I would support maybe 25 more units or something manageable, but hundreds seems like asking for trouble in an emergency. I live on Labrea way and I am glad we have housing for families, down the street, but a common problem is the amount of cars and high occupancy of some of the apartments. The overflow of cars goes all the way to Rosal, and currently I have had cars parked in front of my house for a month and more. It is not a significant problem in my case, but my neighbor who has tenagers with cars, is having to struggle to park their own cars, while the overflow is from housing two blocks away. Obviously San Rafael is a good place for more housing and i would think a place closer to the freeway like Marin Square could be used for extra units of housing. I also would personally like to build an accessory unit in my front yard for a student, teacher, medical professional, at affordable rate. It would be nice to have a department in Marin county who could help seniors like myself design, get permits, and loans to afford to create such units. I myself was a renter in Marin for 36 years and lived in in-law apartments. I found it much more private and a win/win solution for the owner, typically older retired person, and myself as young professional. I was excited about an organization called Lily Pads and attended a meeting but found out later the owner was no longer providing services. So this would be a great thing to promote. Thank you for including us in your work. Hope we can have more affordable housing, while preserving the safety of our neighborhoods.	Email					х			X							x	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		,			,												
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I served on the Santa Venetia Community Plan (SVCP) Committee for almost 10 years, including working with County Staff the last 4 years, until its final adoption in 2017. This process included a thorough survey of our neighbors who commented on every empty parcel and open space for future development (and in fact Godbe told us the response was overwhelming with a higher than normal percentage of participation). Our SVCP Committee Members represented every corner of Santa Venetia. We held community meetings (that were well-attended) so all residents had a chance to voice their opinions and ideas. No one knows Santa Venetia better than Santa Venetians. The plan was supposed to cover everything of interest to ensure a diverse, family-oriented, and happy community for years to come. Adding 442 units is simply untenable for a small, working-class hamlet such as Santa Venetia. The last two open spaces (two ball fields) are slated for high density housing. This is totally uncharacteristic of the surrounding neighbors who live in small, single-family housing. In the February 15th Housing Element Zoom call, with County Staff and Contractors from who knows where?, we were informed that our Community Plan would need to be updated. Who would do this work? When and how soon would these updates happen? How can the County randomly update our Community Plan that we spent so many resources on. SB-9 and SB-10 are a complete contradiction to our Community Plan that we dedicated years of work and volunteer hours to finally see its adoption. These past summers, we've stayed inside due to smoke and/or triple-digit weather. We used a bucket from our shower to water our indoor and deck plants while our yard withered and died due to restrictions and requirements in place from Marin Water. We worked out evacuation routes to alert residents to escape danger due to our one road in and out of Santa Venetia. I heard chain saws, chippers, and weed whackers almost every day, regardless of the high, fire-danger days. This is due to San Rafa	Email									×			×	×			
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I will reiterate the comments I made at the February 15 Housing Element meeting I've lived in SV for over 30 years. I've served on the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association Board of Directors for almost 30 years. Through our neighborhood association, The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA), we try to get the word out so that our residents are aware of upcoming projects and opportunity to comment. We've heard from Santa Venetia residents that they want to protect our quality of life. We are already concerned about the constant fire danger, flooding, Sea Level Rise, ingress and egress, and unsafe evacuation routes. Climate change is a huge concern for us and as well, we have run out of water in Marin County and are under strict mandates, so I can't understand how adding more and more housing units will help. And to restate, 422 units in SV is an increase of almost 25% of the 1,700-1,800 units we currently had, at last count. It's a very shocking number of additional units for us. I grew up in San Rafael. I hate what they've done to the City and have been constantly disappointed with the building choices and what they have given up. I don't want to see that happening in Santa Venetia — more congestion and loss of our green spaces. Affordable nousing sounds great on paper, but we never seem to get that promise fulfilled. I've followed projects in San Rafael and for almost every project, the promise is a huge amount of housing with a small portion designated affordable and then after the project passes through the hurdles, the affordable-housing number is adjusted always downward. I remember previously rules were passed to keep up with the demand of affordable housing, but the goalposts seem to constantly change and that number is lowered. What is the promise that won't happen with this process? Also, I heard them say at that meeting, they were giving schools and churches more flexibility by allowing them to build on parking lots! If that is the case, where will people park? They've already lowered	Email								x	x	x		x	x		x	
I - 251 N San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Re: Marin County Housing and Safety Elements Update, 2023 – 2031. The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA) is an organization representing the interests of 1,700 – 1,800 households (4,474 residents per the 2019 census figures) who live in Santa Venetia. As an organization, we are dedicated to the enhancement and preservation of the character and quality of life of the Santa Venetia neighborhood. We do our best to represent our community and have an established reputation to be a voice for proper development. And in accordance with our mission statement, we, the Board Members of the SVNA, feel compelled to comment on this issue. We want to ensure that the Marin County Board of Supervisors receives an accurate impression from our community regarding the updated Housing Element and are writing today to summarize feedback we have heard from many of our members. Many residents of Santa Venetia, including members of the SVNA, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting where consultants representing the interests of the housing element initiative presented online tools for community feedback. We find these tools inadequate; rather nevroying members of the SVNA, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting where consultants representing the interests of the housing element recommends 422 additional units for Santa Venetia. There are currently fewer than 1,800 residences in Santa Venetia, so this represents an increase of approximately 25%— far more growth than the neighborhood has seen for at least two decades. This mandate seems utterly siloed from the worsening reality of global warming and climate change, (the existence of which was recognized both in the Countywide Plan and by the Marin County Civil Grand Jury) which is leading to catastrophic weather events such as fires and flooding. The upland parts of Santa Venetia not directly threatened by flooding are part of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and are subject to year-round fire danger. Like all of Marin, we are constrained by drought, and our water supply comes	Email				x				x	x			x	х		х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1	1	1	1			1	т —	1	1	1		, ,			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Inverness, Balmoral Way	(Comment edited for length) I am a resident of Old Inverness, specifically Balmoral Way, Please consider the following comments as you finalize your recommendations: The entire approach of this planning effort is misguided. The consultant seems to have arbitrarily plopped new housing onto a map of West Marin without considering County planning history, constraints on the land, or natural resources, let alone community input. This top-down and ill-informed approach is unlikely to succeed, certainly not without damaging community good will, neighborhood cohesion, natural resources and other values of importance. The sites to be developed should be chosen only after a thorough inventory of geology, water supply, slope and other relevant factors. The 2007 Countywide Plan conceived of the entirety of West Marin as a rural, agricultural and low-density region, serving the Bay Area's recreational needs. This reflects the large proportion of the undeveloped lands that are protected as national, state and county parks. Further it carried forward the zoning decisions of the Board of Supervisors in the 1970's, which put a high priority on agricultural and natural resource reservation. If not implemented with great care, this plan risks contravening the supervisors' vision for West Marin. It should not be carried out until the County as a whole considers the larger planning goals for the area. An "elephant-in-the-room" with the housing shortage is the effect of AirBnB. If the County could reign in this business, the housing supply would quickly rebound, with numerous benefits to the community. Additionally, any new regulations for implementing the current planning process must avoid the ironic outcome that the newly constructed residential sites will also be converted to vacation rentals. Indeed, I suggest the County begin its effort to increase housing supply by tackling this behemoth before undertaking the kind of process it is currently enaged in. Assuming willing sellers of residential properties can be found in Balmor	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 16-19)	x	x		x		x		x		x		x	x	x	x	
Inverness, Balmoral Way	I am writing about the draft list of "underutilized residential housing" in Inverness, specifically those listed on Balmoral Way in Inverness. I am the property owner of 5 Balmoral Way. Imagine my surprise to see my own property (and my house which was fully rebuilt in 2015 with full permits from the county) included on this list as "underutilized residential housing." I was even more surprised to see all of my neighbors' homes on Balmoral Way (in which my neighbors live) to be similarly listed. Obviously the folks who came up with these addresses on Balmoral Way made a significant factual error that needs to be corrected by deleting the Balmoral Way addresses from the list. This isn't about NIMBY — this is simply a factual matter that the listed addresses are not underutilized housing sites. Balmoral Way is a small, one-lane, private, drit road with no empty lots. Each lot is already built on and fully-utilized. Each lot has a steep incline. All lots are near the water of Tomales Bay and highly constrained in terms of septic system expansion. While perhaps we residents of Balmoral Way should consider it an honor to be listed as the epicenter of underutilized residential units in Inverness, alas, it is an error by those who compiled the list and is divorced from reality. In summary, as a simple factual matter, the housing stock on Balmoral Way in Inverness is fully-built-up and fully-utilized and should not be listed as "underutilized"; all the Balmoral Way addresses on the "underutilized" list should be removed. Thank you for your kind consideration of this request to correct clear and obvious factual errors in the county's data.	Email	х							x					x			
Inverness, Cottages at Point Reyes Parcel	1982 storms, which unleashed large amounts of mud and rock, and woody detritus, into the bottomlands, and it is unstable as far as landslide danger (take note of the problems on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. above). Without any doubt, these events will be repeated in the future. For these reasons alone, this is one of the least appropriate areas for future housing. Douglas (Dewey) Livingston	Email									х	х		х				
J - 9840 State Route 1 (Olema)	I think that the proposed low cost housing sites and sizes and the solution is not thought out! For instance, the 98 homes in Woodacre would create a huge traffic problem and also be inappropriate. The Olema location and proposal would ruin the nature of Olema! And Dennis Rodoni lives in Olema! The west Marin area has been protected for a reason! The nature and small town is the reason that we are all here! I've lived here for 46 years and believe that it would be more appropriate to absorb the housing on properties that are all ready developed and make it attractive for homeowners to build ADUs Please revise the thinking around this important topic of affordable housing!	Email								x		x						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	T																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 99-101)	x		x		X	x		x		x		х		x	X	
K - 1500 Butterfield Road (Sleepy Hollow)	I live in Sleepy Hollow. I am concerned about the San Dominico site (which proposes adding 90 housing units to a community with ~800 households) for two main reasons. 1) Safety. Butterfield is a one way in one way out road. In case of evacuation, increasing the households by over 10% is troubling. Cars at the far end of Butterfield tend to speed. Adding more cars at the very end of the road significantly increases the risk of cars speeding. 2) Traffic. There is almost no public transportation on Butterfield. San Dominico already has a strict traffic commitment with the community because traffic is so bad. This would make it worse. There are three schools which adds to the traffic on Butterfield. Best practices for increasing housing is to do infill in urban areas. This is the opposite. It's building far away from public transportation and freeway access. What makes the most sense is to build as close to highway 101, bus terminals, Smart, etc.	Email				х		х						х				
L - 26500 Main Street (Tomales)	Your proposal to place 186 low-income units on this site is not fair nor does it make sense for the following reasons: You will take away a little league ball field currently used by the nearby communities. t may displace the early development center on the site. he immediate area already supports a section 8 housing community at the corner of North San Pedro and Schmidt Lane. This development will put an unfair burden on the surrounding neighborhood. here is a site at McPhail School down the road on North San Pedro that accommodate the same number of units without removing the little league field and have less visibility to the nearby neighborhood. As stated in another comment, Bon Air shopping center could accommodate most if not all of these units.	Email			x					x								
Lucas Valley	I do not support the proposed quantity of housing proposed for Lucas Valley. I am concerned about water resources, evacuation congestion in a fire, lack of services for new people in the area, increased road congestion and increased wildfire risk. This is not a NIMBY response. The Rotary Village is a great example of affordable housing for seniors that is near our community which is lovely. Expanding this type of housing would be welcome. Highrises are not welcome as they do not fit-in with our area. greatly reduced quantity of one or two story homes would be welcome. Why are we targeted with such a large percentage of the proposed housing? This is not an equitable plan. thought the Governor wanted housing in urban centers where services were available. Your plan does not meet this key criteria.	Email			x	х				х		х		х	х		х	
Lucas Valley	I have resided in Upper Lucas Valley since 1986. Part of the appeal when I purchased here was the rural setting. Although I understand the need for housing, high density housing is inappropriate for Marin, i.e. large multi-unit structures. I welcome the addition of single family residences as many younger people need homes here desperately. I'm not sure where they would be situated in this area, but am open to suggestions. When George Lucas proposed affordable housing further down Lucas Valley Road, the main concern was the lack of transportation, grocery stores, and the other necessities. It made no sense. Another suggestion would be to make it possible for seniors to give (not sell) their larger homes to their children, purchase smaller homes and retain their property tax base. Most people in that position don't/can't move because buying a smaller home for \$1+ million brings with it property taxes they would find unaffordable. The only way it is currently possible is to sell your existing home and buy a cheaper one. When thinking of housing, perhaps the smart thing to do is build an area of affordable homes in the 1100-1500 square foot range for seniors. That would free up many, many existing homes for growing families.				×			х									x	
Lucas Valley	I just want to officially voice my opposition to the development of additional homes in the Lucas Valley area. While I support the development of affordable housing in Marin County, protecting our undeveloped green spaces is an even higher priority. Instead, I believe areas that have already been developed (green space replaced with concrete) such as towns in southern Marin or places like Northgate Mall would be better options for new housing. Our undeveloped green spaces are priceless and irreplaceable!	Email								х		х						
Lucas Valley	It's come to my attention the HOA to which I belong is objecting to proposed increased housing in Lucas Valley. I would like to inform you that the Lucas Valley HOA is not uniform in this opinion. There are members, such as myself, that would welcome additional housing in Lucas Valley. While I found some of the HOA's arguments moderately persuasive (especially with regard to access to public transportation), I believe the need for more affordable housing in Marin trumps all of their points. I encourage you to keep Lucas Valley on your radar for proposed housing sites, and to find ways to encourage and incentivize more public transportation in our community.	Email						х									х	х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1							_	_								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential housing in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2, Juvenile Detention Center/Leanette Prandi Way 3. 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors includer: High Wildfirer Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in modern ar	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 173-178)		x		x				x		×	x	×	x		x	
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	wildlire-prone areas and closer to urban centers.	Email										Х		Х				
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	Due to FIRE danger and Drought please stop more construction in Mount Marin and Lucas Valley.	Email							1	1				Х	Х			oxdot
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I am against housing development down Lucas valley and Marinwood. The weather here gets windy starting in spring and ends in the late fall. The surrounding mountains can catch on fire as we had a small one last year. With the drought we are already under rationing. A spark can create a fire and the wind will carry it all over the place. There are no exits except Lucas Valley road and in case of a fire it will be difficult for all to evacuate. Most locations you are considering are in heavily populated areas. Where would we go in case of a fire? 101 will be impacted. Yes we need affordable housing, not more multi million dollar homes. If the water department would consider building a desalination plant off the bay of San Francisco it would help us out. We are in global warming and more cars on the road and more pollution will set us back. What about the empty land space between Novato and Petaluma?	Email				х				x				х	х	х	х	
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I am extremely concerned about the proposed new developments in the Lucas Valley Marinwood area, especially when taken together with other large new development projects in the nearby vicinity. I realize California has a housing issue. However, destroying existing communities is not the solution. The number of added housing units in the LVM area alone will utterly destroy our school system. The Mill Creek School district currently serves about 2000 students. Just one proposal would add 1800 homes and possibly triple our student needs. Where will these children go to school? Similarly, almost 250 homes in the Prandi location would increase the Lucas Valley Elementary school population by a similar 200%. This will overwhelm our schools, and other community services. If there is another huge build at the Northgate site, also in the Miller Creek School district, it was even worse. I'm also worried about many environmental considerations that seem to be ignored. One has only to look at the debacle of the Talus development to see that these plans are not in the interest of the community or environment. These were not affordable homes for teachers and firefighters, but large expensive homes with big lots. Now we have a razed hillside, threats to our creek, destruction of few remaining heritage trees and wildlife habitar and one giant fire hazard with an enormous pile of dead trees and brush. This is what happens when projects are rammed through without proper review and oversight. Traffic increases will be a nightmare. In an emergency, how do we escape with the gridlocks that will occur? Lucas Valley Road and 101 are already jammed with cars especially at commute times. We are in continuing drought, unlikely to ever improve thanks to climate change. Where does the water come from for this new population? A few of the proposed sites make sense but this large scale unbalanced load into our small community does not. Any development should be tailored to fit the need (ie truly affordable housing, not a token 5%) and addre	Email			×					x		x		×			x	
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I am writing in regards to the proposed multi unit housing in Unincorporated Marin County. I'm against using open space to build housing. The site in the open space on Lucas Valley Road should be used for a community park or sports center for the community. Kids need a place to go that could include Basketball, Swimming, Playstructure and lawn for families. I understand the need for additional affordable and Multi-Family housing in Marin, but why Open Space? The County should be looking to improve areas that need improvement, not use open space to pour concrete and build multi level boxes. What about repurposing and improving small strip mall areas all along the freeways? These building have small space and often times run down retail shops and turning those in to thriving shops with housing above. Several responsible counties and cities have successfully done this. Why can't Marin think this way? I don't understand it. Open space should remain open space or for public park use. Dilapidated buildings should should be improved to include affordable housing for the better of the community.	Email										x						
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I moved to San Rafael specifically to get out of the city and to avoid over congestion, traffic and over development. The proposed additional housing in Marinwood and Lucas Valley will detract from the exact reason I moved here. Over development of north bay is an issue - and just because there is land does not mean it should be developed, which will permanently change the character of the community and landscape. I was unable to sign the petition against the new development, so sending this email instead. Thanks.	Email				х				х		х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	T																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. The Housing Distribution Scenario says: Ensure Countywide Distribution - really? It looks like a disproportionate amount of it is in unincorporated Marinwood/Lucas Valley - 3,569 units to be exact. And some things to remember: We are a fire danger area now that we have had a fire evacuation this last summer. And what happens to road traffic during an evacuation? And it they don't drive, what happens to them? And what about the Water Shortage in Marin County with conservation being the ONLY SOLUTION so far? It is my understanding that the builders of these units won't have to pay property tax. So what does THAT do to our schools? Fire Department? EMT? And who picks up the tabMarinwood/Lucas Valley homeowners? And do we pick up the tax tab for ALL THE UNINCORPORATED AREA of 3,569 units? Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities: Can the residents of these residents drive? Are they close to services, jobs, transportation and amenities? I don't think so, especially if they can't drive.	Email			x	x		х						x				
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	The 2022 Marin County Candidates site for Unincorporated Marin and especially Marinwood/ Lucas Valley/Silveria Ranch is absurd. It targets just 5 square miles with 80% of the housing allocation for affordable housing in one community WITHOUT resential planning for schools, roads, government services, water, sewer and other essential services. Why "plan to fail"? Shouldn't a good faith effort to build affordable housing in our community laso include a comprehensive plan for accommodating growth? It doesn't. This is why it should be rejected today. Instead, let's address the core questions for growth AND the financial impact of adding massive amount of largely non profit housing to a single community WITHOUT ADDITIONAL TAX BASE. Marinwood/Lucas Valley currently has approximately 2700 housing units for 6000 residents. The proposed housing sites could add 2300 apartments and 5500 residents who ALL WILL NEED schools, water, government services, transportation, access to shopping, etc. Shouldn't a proper plan for growth precede approval for housing? One of the sites listed is Marinwood Plaza, our communities ONLY commercial plaza within walking distance for thousands of fresidents. If the plan for 160 units is approved, this would squeeze out a vital community center to the detriment of all. This is not including the problem of TOXIC WASTE contamination clean up suitable for residential dwelling is a long way off despite community pressure on the Regional Water Quality Control Board who will not enforce its own clean up orders on the current owners. Despite the harsh criticism of the RHNA process, I believe there is a real community desire for more affordable housing in a community that will be planned appropriately, won't redevelop our neighborhoods and utilize open spaces like Silveira Ranch, St Vincents and other sites. While everyone I know supports the idea of more housing, not a single one wants a poorly conceived plan that forces large housing projects without considering the impacts. Reject the current RHNA p	Email		x	×					x		x				x		
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services- sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/delii: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi; 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near etrar Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		х	х	х				х				x				
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.4: Consider Environmental Hazards: WATER AND WILDFIRE This pertains to most of Marin County. We have a limited supply of resources to accommodate doubling of the population of marinwood/Lucas valley.	Email								х		х						
Lucas Valley / Marinwood	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,569 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Balcakstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 LucasValley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge; 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concerns regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,112 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of additional units represents an enormous growth for the acroa, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Val	Email			×	x				x		x			X			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL				1		1		1	1	1							
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Lucas Valley / Mt. Muir Court	(Comment edited for length) The Lucas Valley Homeowner's Association represents 538 homes in the special R-1:B-LV zoning track in Upper Lucas Valley. We, the Board of Directors of the LVHA, would like to give our support for the efforts to increase housing in Marin County, and offer the following input. To begin with, our State Governor's Housing Plan incentivizes housing in urban centers near transportation and services, to reduce reliance on vehicles and their carbon footprint. If the County chooses a path contrary to the State Plan, and not utilize State funding incentives for urban development, then we ask for a reevaluation of the housing sites identified for our Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. As outlined below, areas 1 - 3 are both contrary to the RHNA requirements and pose a danger for emergency evacuations. There are several sites identified as potential home building sites in our area. 1. Lucas Valley Road / Mt Muir Court 2, Juvenile Detention Center/Jeanette Prandi Way 3, 7 Mt Lassen 4, 530 Blackstone Dr 5. Marinwood Market area. We agree that the Marinwood Market area is a suitable site. It is close to freeway access and has sufficient infrastructure in place, including amenities like food and gas, and can easily absorb new development. Ironically, the relative quantity proposed/identified at this site is comparably less than the quantity for site #2 above, which is a much less suitable site as shown in following comments. There are several factors that make areas 1 - 3 only marginally suitable for new building sites, and therefore should, at best, be only allowed limited building. Factors include: High Wildfire Risk - Single Limited Evacuation Route. Water Shortages. Lack of Infill Infrastructure. Building Atop Unmarked Graves. Zoning Restrictions: The special zoning district for Upper Lucas Valley (R-1:B-LV) limits most buildings to a single story. The district was created in order to adhere to the architectural vision and design aesthetic of Joseph Eichler, a renowned architect highly influential in	Email (See Email Comments Received PDF, pp. 173-178)		x		x				x		x	x	×	x		x	
Lucas Valley, Grady Ranch Development	Addendum to LVHA Housing Statement: EIR Traffic Impact Report Needed For Emergency Evacuations on Lucas Valley Road. The recent wildfire emergency evacuation of Upper Lucas Valley in 10/12/21 caused a logiam of traffic on the only road out, the 2-lane Lucas Valley Road. It has belatedly been brought to our attention that the Grady Ranch development, currently in works (224 housing units), also has Lucas Valley Road as their only exit in a wildfire emergency. When the units are complete, they could add another 300 - 500 cars in an emergency (footnote 1 below). Adding even hundreds of more vehicles onto Lucas Valley Road from the 338 new potential housing units projected, could prove disastrous (footnote 2 below). In addition, any traffic study in an EIR report would also have to take into consideration the potential for a significant number of ADU housing units within the corridor. Lucas Valley Road already seems to have all the traffic it can handle during an emergency evacuation. The LVHA would therefore request that a traffic study be done in advance of earmarking any significant number of additional housing units along the Lucas Valley Road corridor.	Email				x				x				X				
Lucas Valley, Mt. Muir Court	Thank you for taking time to read over my thoughts on the new housing developments proposed for Jeanette Prandi Way, Mount Muir Court, Marinwood Plaza and 7 Lassen. As a Marin County native of 58 years and a Lucas valley resident of 26 years, I am surprised that these projects are so close to approval without adequate community outreach and input. There are many items of concern that I don't feel have been adequately answered for me to support these developments. At this time I am strongly opposed to these developments. I am respectfully requesting more time for our community to better understand these proposals and how we can collaboratively help the County solve its low income housing challenges.	Email																
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I am extremely perturbed that plans are being made to build housing in within the wetlands and flood zone contained in the old Silveira ranch and St Vincent's properties. This wetlands will become increasingly important as the sea level rises and flood zones will be even less inhabitable year round. This will leave any housing there soon uninhabitable but some builder richer and some county officials who only went through the motions of actually providing affordable housing. This issue was already explored and sanity prevailed in leaving the wetlands to be wetlands. Any housing, affordable or otherwise, should be built on appropriate land, not a flood zone which will damage any housing built on it.	Email									х						х	
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	for the infrastructure of this small area. Additionally, all of these proposed development sites are within the Miller Creek School District boundaries and the unfunded impact of these developments on the District would be disastrous. Since the District is currently funded using a Basic Aid Model, it gets no per pupil funding. This means that all the additional students these developments generate will not result in additional funding for the District.	Email		×	x					x							x	
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I found the online tools for commenting cumbersome and inscrutable, and much too time consuming to use. So, the following are my comments about specific housing allotment recommendations in Marinwood Lucas Valley. St Vincent's School - 1800: NO Because there is little infrastructure at St. Vincents, including access to schools and public transportation, this is a poor site for development. Certainly not 1800 units which is an entire community. The only housing at St. Vincents should be limited to students (dorms) and staff.	Email		х	х			х		х								
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I hope that the Marinwood Plaza/market site is again under consideration for housing. As you most likely know, some 15 years or so ago, the community shot down an excellent proposal from Bridge Housing. Except for the market, the property remains a derelict eyesore. Many of us in Marinwood would like to see the property improved, including a modest amount of housing development, along with community amenities such as a coffee shop, brew pub, or other gathering place, and other shops such as hair salon, co-working space, etc. It is close to public transportation, schools, and major employers most notably Kaiser. It's a far superior site for development than the St Vincents property which has myriad sea level rise and other environmental challenges, and very little other infrastructure. I hope the property will be on be on tomorrow's meeting agenda.	Email		х							х	х						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I oppose 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. West Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.	Email															х	х

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1			1	1 1	ı —	1	1			1		1			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I oppose a housing development the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. 1. West Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. 2. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. 3. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. 4. Building would ruin agricultural, rural beauty which is so precious to the San Geronimo Valley. 5. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Or work with the state to move San Quentin out to a more appropriate place for a prison such as barren land in the dessert, and make a beautiful development on the waterfront right next to shops and the ferry and the Richmond Bridge which would be easy access to transportation and would not overburden Sir Francis Drake which is already far too congested. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.	Email										x					х	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I see the maps and have concerns that things aren't matching. Then two of the sites are still contaminated from the former cleaners at Marinwood Market Plaza - St. Vincent's and Marinwood Market Plaza. So what happens with the housing planned in these locations?1936 units?	Email														Х		
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I think we should spend our time, energy and money on housing the homeless and low income people at the property near St. Vincents just south of Novato. As you may have noticed, people who work in our communities, but can not live here because of the cost, commute from Richmond and Vallejo and we see the traffic jams every day at commute times. I have heard of a toll coming for Hwy 37, making it even more costly for people who can not afford to live here.	Email																х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I'm taking this opportunity as a resident of Upper Lucas Valley in Marin to voice my views/concerns about the housing sites under consideration in my area: In general: I don't know what constitutes median vs low income, but in general I support add'l housing strategically placed and sensitively designed (to minimize negative impact on the environment and established communities) for essential workers such as school teachers, sheriff, police & fire dept and hospital staffers, many of whom currently commute long distances to work in the areas they serve. I'd like to see new homeowning opportunities (at below market rates) made available to these workers, as building more high-priced rental units serves no one but property owners. Sites under consideration in the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School – 1800; Marinwood Market – 136. These are both logical, less problematic sites for development, as they are walkable to the GG bus stop at/near Miller Creek & Marinwood Aves, with quick, easy access to the 101 fnyy. I really hope to see sensitive urban planning on the St. Vincents site, so the beautiful open space currently grazed by cows does not become yet another soulless jungle of buildings standing shoulder to shoulder facing the freeway. Speaking as someone who's actually rooting for the Smart Train to not only survive, but thrive: part of any development of these sites should include a bike path/paths to connect either or both to the Civic Center Smart station. And/or a shuttle bus (it's too long to walk for commuters),530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) – 32. I've no knowledge/opinion re: this site. 7 Mt Lassen (site of office park) – 58. 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall) – 254. My husband & I currently rent an office at 7 Mt. Lassen, so it's news to us that this site's under consideration. It's a beautiful, unique office setting that serves both the Upper and Lower Lucas Valley communities as a place of business to walk to! I'd hate to see that disappear!!! However, I would	Email			x	х		X	х			x		X			×	х
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	I'm writing to express concern about the proposal to put 1800 units of new housing at St Vincents in Lucas Valley. This number is incredibly high - it would overwhelm the Miller Creek School district. There are many other sites proposed in Lucas Valley. I'm not saying no to all of them, but this has got to get more reasonable. Please don't destroy what is now a beautiful community. Marinwood is a special place. We can't absorb all this housing - some please, but nowhere close to the number of units proposed.	Email			х					х								
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	Public Feedback - Marinwood/St Vincents housing proposal: I was only recently made aware of the current preliminary proposal for housing allocation to the unincorporated areas of marin county. As a current resident who grew up in Marinwood Lucas Valley - left the county - and returned to raise my family here - I cannot more strongly oppose the sheer volume of proposed housing for the Marinwood/Lucas Valley areas. This location (Marinwood/Lucas Valley) is already underserved by commercial services and has a lack of job opportunities. It is a small bedroom community sandwiched between the commercial hubs of San Rafael and Novato. Any significant shopping or professional services require a vehicle trip to either the city of San Rafael or to the city of Novato. The added burden of the new development proposals would grossly increase the negative environmental impacts that the lack of nearby commercial services already causes. Furthermore the 101 interchanges both North and South already can barely handle the traffic that exists. More housing in this area without addressing current school campus, sport field, open space, park and community center availability and other critical services would have a significant negative impact on the community and not balance the Supervisors stated goal of 'equitable distribution' throughout the county. The schools within the Miller Creek School District are also nearly at capacity. Many of the campuses operate with nearly a third of classrooms being in 'portable' classrooms and have had to take over outdoor recreation areas for portable classroom locations. Our youth sports also already operate at a deficit of field/court availability relative to the active youth that participate. I urge the planning department and the board of supervisors to re-evaluate the Marinwood/Lucas Valley area and not look to force nearly 60% of the county's unincorporated housing allotment into our small bedroom community.	Email			x	x				x		×						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				x				x				
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below. 1: Ensure Countywide Distribution: The majority of housing in unincorporated Marin County is being distributed to Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY. This does not appear to be an equitable distribution and will potentially double the population of this area, affecting all services-sheriff, fire, schools, traffic, etc. Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY area is being considered for a majority of this housing in unincorporated Marin: St Vincents: 1800 Marinwood Market: 136 Blackstone (site of religious house): 32 Mt Lassen/deli: 58 Jeanette Prandi/Juvi: 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26 Total: 2306. (This could be up to 60% of the total housing for unincorporated Marin) Households in Marinwood/LUCAS VALLEY currently 2412. (This could potentially double our size)	Email		x	x	x				x				х				
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; St Vincents is a large undeveloped area that could likely support some housing, but 1800 units does not limit building on open land.	Email								х		Х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1			_	1			_						-			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	This letter is in regards to the proposed site and distribution of housing in the Lucas Valley/Marinwood area. While I feel this area can support some expansion, the amount proposed by the county is overwhelming. Per the board of supervisors principles, please note my feedback below.3: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities; St Vincents is a large undeveloped area that could likely support some housing, but 1800 units does not limit building on open land.	Email								х		х						
M - 1 St Vincents Drive(St. Vincents)	We have seen the preliminary list of potential housing sites for Marin County, including in unincorporated areas such as Marinwood/Lucas Valley, as developed by the ABAG (Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan), and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. The plan includes 2,412 units within the Lucas Valley / Marinwood area (accounting for 68% of the 3,659 units within unincorporated Marin County). Sites under consideration in the Marinwood / Lucas Valley areas: St Vincent's School - 1,800; Marinwood Market - 136; 530 Blackstone Drive (site of religious house) - 32 7; Mt Lassen (site of office park) - 58; 2 Jeannette Prandi Way (site of Juvenile Hall); 254 Lucas Valley Rd/near terra Linda Ridge: 26. We are not opposed to some moderate increase of housing units in the area. However, we have some serious concern regarding these potential sites: (1) The Lucas Valley / Marinwood area currently has less than roughly 1,750 homes, spread across a roughly 3.5 mile valley corridor, almost all of which are single family dwellings, and the overwhelming majority of which are one or two story homes. There are no large multi-unit apartment buildings in this area. The overall magnitude of the increase in units in this area (2,14 units) is disproportionately large compared to the current housing density of the area. The proposed increase would more than double the overall number of housing units in the area. (2) The area to the south and west of St. Vincent's School (east of HWY 101) has been discussed as a potential development site for some time. Although multi-unit housing could easily be developed there, adding 1,800 units would completely overwhelm the property and this very large number of auditional units represents an enormous growth for the area, on the same order of units as currently exist in all of Lucas Valley / Marinwood. To fit this large number of units, the development would likely include large three (or more) story structures, which do not currently exist anywhere in this				x	x				x		×			×			
Muir Woods Lodge (Tam Valley)	After much thought and consultation with some neighbors, I'd like to submit the motel that is across from the Holiday Inn – the Muir Woods Lodge – as a possible housing site. You may know that the previous motel next door – with the big sign that says "Fireside" was converted to housing some years ago. If the Muir Woods Lodge is similarly converted, it would not create much additional traffic, as the paterns are already established.	Email																х
Nazareth House (San Rafael)	Additionally, there are also at least two other projects (the 670-unit Northgate and 100-unit Nazareth House developments) which are within our school district but not in unincorporated Marin. Likewise, neither of these developments, both within the Miller Creek School District, will generate per pupil funding for either the Miller Creek K-8 schools or the San Rafael High School district. That means that even though there will be many more students to serve, there will be no additional funding with which to do so. Additionally, these developments generate little to no parcel tax money and some are even exempt from the meager development fees which means the District would receive no money at all to build additional classrooms or to hire additional teachers to serve all the additional students that would be generated.	Email			х													
No Location Specified (Countywide)	All should be near public transportation and shopping. Walking is good for all of us	Email						Х	Х									
No Location Specified (Countywide)	Any & all housing proposed in Marin county should be near public transportation and shopping. Adding additional cars to the area doesn't make environmental sense so low cost housing should be in convenient locations	Email			Х			Х										
No Location Specified (Countywide)	Any and all housing sites should consider availability of public transportation and availability of services, ie, grocery stores and pharmacies. It makes no sense to put any housing in out of the way sites where more cars are put on the road. Housing closer to hwy 101 is appropriate.	Email			Х			Х										<u></u>
No Location Specified (Countywide)	As I am sure, many of our concerns may have already been asked but there is a need better communicate the information to the community. The follow are questions/ concerns: Who performed the study to identify potential areas for the housing sites? What determines the income used for each Housing category (ie local income, county income, housing prices)? How will residence commute from there new homes? Mass/public transportation? Where will retail commerce be located? Will the county exercise Eminent Domain Power? Effect to local taxes, for local bond issues created as a result increased population (Schools, roads, sewers, law enforcement, fire protection other county servicers)?	Email		Х	x			х						х	х		х	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	homes when there are not enough resources for those that are already here? Also, with the State allowing easy addition of ADUs on existing properties, it appears that some housing needs will be unwittingly filled that way (along with additional strain on resources)	Email				х									х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I am urging you to not proceed with the presently proposed Housing Element plans in incorporated Marin County. While affordable housing is a concern, so is sustainability. I do not believe the current plan balances these needs adequately. Please allow time for a more thoughtful discussion with more public engagement before proceeding.	Email										х						
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I am very concerned about the large number of homes that the state is requiring Marin to build, with no local control. We are already short of water. Where do they think we will the supply for more homes. As a minimum any new building should only be done with companion infrastructure improvements to handle it such as water, traffic, local schools, etc. I believe there should be push back to the state legislature regarding push to urbanize many parts of our county without thought or planning for the effects of such building.	Email		х	х	х				х					х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I do not think there should be housing put into rural meadows but should concentrate on areas that are near existing commercial or developed areas that are not being used. Why change Marin to be like other congested counties that have houses Everywhere willy-nilly and people have to have cars and use gas to get anywhere they need to go? Marin County has a beautiful and peacefulness in the open meadows and hillsides. Please don't jeopardize the county by putting the housing along open space meadowlands and hillsides.	Email										х						<u> </u>
	I find your proposals rushed and not well thought out. I am in favor of taking a more thoughtful and balanced approach.	Email	l .	Ī	ı	1	l .	1	1	i	1	Ì					1	

•	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I fully support measures to increase housing in Marin County, especially those targeted for low income housing. I reject the disguised racism and NIMBY attitude present among naysayers, even if it were to depress my own home's value. I support both racial and economic diversity as a strength of our community. It's unconscionable that wealthy Marin residents want the best schools, but don't want low paid teachers to be able to afford to also live here. This goes double for housecleaners, yard workers, and other very low wage workers who have to spend a significant portion of their income commuting. Let's stand up to the madness of a vocal few and do the right thing.	Email															x	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	I like how an unelected board (ABAG) comes up with this huge number and threatens the county with a big stick. Never mind the additional water resources that would be needed for all these new residents in a drought prone area.	Email													х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	Marin Housing authority, It seems like the enthusiasm to push this through the County is ignoring a grievous situation. Already, even with water limitations, the County is poorly prepared to grow without greater water resources. This is truly the 'elephant in the middle of the room'. No expansion on this scale can possible be discussed without responsible delivery of adequate water. Thank you for considering my voice.	Email													х			
No Location Specified (Countywide)	My primary concern is the same one I always have: how will increasing housing affect the environment? A number of sites would require cutting down trees or building close to streams. We need MORE trees, preferably native oaks, to protect soil, reduce moisture loss, & provide shade. Open space is NOT wasted space. Talking about affordable housing sounds good, but I keep seeing huge vanity houses being built. There's a 4,000 ft2 just down the road from me that stands empty most of the time. All that construction required scarce building materials and created lots of air & noise pollution. Is slapping an affordable-housing tag on these projects just another sneaky way for people to invest in real estate? How does packing people into fire-prone areas make sense? What about drought and the impact of more construction & people? Why not buy back or forbid the ownership of 2nd & 3rd homes? Why not build housing in strip malls? Disrespecting the environment is how we got into this mess.	Email										х		X		х	х	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	My view is that the changes proposed will change the character of this lovely region	Email										х						
No Location Specified (Countywide)	The county of Marin has reached peak density due to water and transportation constraints. Minimal new housing should be constructed in Marin County. The housing problem is a statewide problem and it should be addressed at the state level. New cities should be constructed along the Hwy. 5 and 99 corridors near the planned high speed rail lines. The state also needs to build treatment centers for the mentally ill and the drug addicted individuals that are currently living on the streets. These centers can also be placed where land and resources are less expensive. The current uncoordinated county by county plans will only decrease the quality of life and increase expenses for all.	Email			х	x		х		х					х		х	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	We are being asked to find housing numbers 19k what we were asked in the last planning cycle. Why? If this is because ABAG is, once again trying to the Marin housing numbers to SF through their "sphere of influence" concept, this has already been disproven, since Marin is not a bedroom community to SF. ABAG needs to understand that they cannot just wave their magic wand, and buildable lots appear! Affordable Housing needs are real, and Marin has been a very expensive place to live, both in housing costs and in cost of food, gas and everything else, so we are not a very affordable place to live, even once housed, ites with sea level rise issues should not be considered for new housing. Period. Building housing for the disadvantaged in these areas is not social justice, or even good planning. Parking on site is a must in Marin, regardless of any loopholes in SB9. Especially on the hills, where the streets are substandard, parking on the streets has already created impossible access for fire and other emergency vehicles, or even 2-way traffic. This has been caused by the County neglecting to demand the roads be improved before development went in. These are death traps in the event of the fire we know will come some day! Planning has allowed development to continue on substandard roads, particularly on hills. This poor planning has created fire traps throughout the county that people will not be able to evacuate from. These sites should also not be further developed, especially for those in need, without adding the infrastructure that will insure the safety of the residents, is adequate roads that can handle an evacuation. Other infrastructure needs to be updated to handle increased demands, such as sewers, to meet the unplanned expansions mandated by SB (How will we meet these sea level rise impacting existing housing and major roads, and fire. While we are redesigning these we may have opportunities to find new housing sites. I hear the Strawberry Seminary has sold its property. There is a vast opportunity for a	Email		×		x	x				x	×		x	x		x	
No Location Specified (Countywide)	We are being asked to find housing numbers 19x what we were asked in the last planning cycle. Why? If this is because ABAG is, once again trying to tie Marin housing numbers to SF through their "sphere of influence" concept, this has already been disproven, since Marin is not a bedroom community to SF. ABAG needs to understand that they cannot just wave their magic wand, and buildable lots appear!	Email											i					
No Location Specified (Countywide)	We should not be approving any more new developments without increasing our water supply.	Email													х			
No Location Specified (East Marin)	Please keep the housing developments in east Marin as our beloved former politicians planned in the early 1960's as detailed in the documentary "Rebels with a Cause".	Email										Х						
No Location Specified (San Geronimo and Nicasio)	Dear Board of Supervisors, I am writing to thank you and the County staff for the outstanding work you have been doing on the new Housing Element for Marin County. I especially appreciate the community education and outreach by the County to actively engage residents during these past few months. The workshops on the Housing Element and the Balancing Act tool offered important information on the unmet need for affordable housing and also the criteria that could to be used as guides in the decision-making process. I also want to thank Leelee Thomas and the entire Community Development Agency staff for the virtual workshop on February 16th for unincorporated West Marin. More than 100 people attended, many with purposeful, well-informed questions. Leelee and staff responded to all of the questions in a knowledgeable, meaningful and insightful manner. In addition to housing sites, It was good to hear that County staff are working to try and find solutions to some of the most vexing issues that impede and discourage the creation of affordable homes: septic issues, waste treatment and grey water systems, and building code and zoning restrictions. I very much appreciate your dedication and support of affordable housing in Marin. We all have a lot of work to do. Attached are my ideas about possible sites for affordable housing sites in the San Geronimo Valley and Nicasio. (Note: attachment apparently not included)	Email															х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	_							1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
No Location Specified (San Geronimo Valley?)	Increasing the potential for 200+ more cars getting through the SFD corridor during rush hour? Traffic is already a nightmare morning and night. Adding houses to a community struggling to maintain homeowners insurance due to wildfire vulnerability? This is really poor thinking and poor planning. I support seeking SOME alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations but there are possibilities along the 101 corridor that make much more sense. Please think forward instead of short sightedly.	Email				х								х				
No Location Specified (West Marin)	I agree with and adopt as my own the comments submitted by the Environmental Action Committee of West Marin (EAC), and request that you add my name in support of EAC's position. And additionally, and by all means, Marin County MUST maintain the zoning (A-60) and all other policies designed to protect and enhance agriculture in West Marin. (Note: unable to identify EAC comments which are referred to.)	Email										х						
No Location Specified (West Marin)	I am extremely concerned about more housing going up in West Marin due to fire danger and the already impossible likelihood of getting out of Marin from West Marin due to the lack of roads to get out. How can more housing be considered when there are only a couple ways out and if traffic in Fairfax is bottled up and the ONLY way out is going east then valley residents are screwed. Housing should only be considered in areas nearest the freeways. The golf course should only be for open space and recreation. Fire danger is a serious threat.	Email				х						х		х				
No Location Specified (West Marin)	In West Marin we are on septic systems. It is horrendously expensive to get anything done here., costing up to \$ 100,000 easily for a simple system. Then the County is imposing annual extra fees for people who have non standard systems of any kind. It makes this unfeasible for all but the most wealthy. I and many of my neighbors would be amenable to putting an ADU on our property BUT for the septic issues. There are alternatives - electric toilets, or other things that could be researched. Also, the County must come up with an affordable septic pricing. Plus, the contractors have no incentive to keep their costs in line, even with their proposals. I have heard time and again, how Questa got a bid, must have been the lowest bid, then they went over budget, (by \$15,000 or \$20,000) and to get the house signed off, approved, and be able to move in, the homewomer paid the extortion, I mean, bill. The County could at least provide a service where homeowners could put their comments in about septic contractors for prospective septic owners to see. Thanks for listening.	Email													x			
No Location Specified (West Marin)	The consideration of this site (275 Olive Avenue) raises a concern that other similarly inappropriate sites may also be up for consideration in other parts of Marin. Would it be possible to get a list of any sites that are within 500 feet of a wetland? I studied wetland habitat restoration planning in graduate school, and was under the impression that CEQA/CWA sect 404 prevented projects from being built on top of or close to wetlands.	Email										х						
Northgate Development (San Rafael)	Additionally, there are also at least two other projects (the 670-unit Northgate and 100-unit Nazareth House developments) which are within our school district but not in unincorporated Marin. Likewise, neither of these developments, both within the Miller Creek School District, will generate per pupil funding for either the Miller Creek K-8 schools or the San Rafael High School district. That means that even though there will be many more students to serve, there will be no additional funding with which to do so. Additionally, these developments generate little to no parcel tax money and some are even exempt from the meager development fees which means the District would receive no money at all to build additional classrooms or to hire additional teachers to serve all the additional students that would be generated.	Email			х													
Novato, Atherton Corridor	Hello. Thank you for the information and materials regarding the Housing Element on the website. I have reviewed all of the materials and have the following questions the answers to which will help me and others comment and provide input in a more informed way. Because of the 1,000 character limit, this is the 1st of 3 emails with 9 total questions. The Draft Candidate Sites Inventory charts you have provided do not break-out extremely low-, very low-, and low-income units. The Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook under Government Code Section 65583.2 (the "Guidebook") seems to require this, and Marin County's FAQ 15 breaks down the 3,569 total into those 3 categories plus moderate and above moderate. Can you please provide that more defined breakdown of all 5 categories by site? 1. It would be very helpful to have a chart for the Draft Candidate Sites Inventory that lists the units under each of the four scenarios. Is that something you have? Can you please provide it? 2. Under Part A, Step 3 please provide the infrastructure availability or plans for the Atherton Corridor sites. 3. Under Part A, Step 6 please provide the factors considered to accommodate low and very low-income housing for all of the sites. 4. Under Part B, for the Atherton Corridor sites, please provide the evidence that the site is realistic and feasible for lower income housing. 5. Is there a master plan for all of the low-income housing, up to 516 units, for the Atherton Corridor? Does any plan consider sidewalks, traffic lights, parking spaces and public transit? How many buildings and floors on each site are envisioned? 6. Under Part C, the capacity analysis, and in particular Step 2, what were the factors to calculate the realistic capacity of the Atherton Corridor sites including redevelopment of the non-vacant sites? 7. Under Part D, why are the non-vacant sites in the Atherton Corridor sites including redevelopment of the non-vacant sites? 8. Under Part D, Step 3A, what is the basis for finding that the current residential use f	Email	x	x													x	
Novato, Atherton Corridor	How would you feel if the County identified your home as the possible site for rezoning to accommodate high-density housing but neglected to notify you??? And then justified its inaction as inconsequential because the properties are only under preliminary consideration. That's what happened in the Community Development Agency's Feb. 17 presentation. I call it arrogant, insensitive, high-handed and totally inappropriate. Furthermore, the process of identifying these properties is opaque at best. It is irresponsible to proceed while disregarding the infrastructure necessary to support new homes, particularly in our drought-stressed, fire-endangered landscape. It's not the kind of government that respects its citizens. I am particularly troubled that the planning for the Atherton unincorporated areas ignores the Fireman's Fund 1000-home development in Novato less than a mile away. Dumping 1400 homes into this concentrated area spells disaster and will overwhelm the San Marin-Atherton interchange.* The "Guiding Principles" you adopted in December include "environmental hazards," but they recklessly disregard the practicalities of building on these sites and the adverse impact on the local environment, it's time to go back to the drawing boards and this time develop a reality-based plan that honors your constituents. *Construction of 101 in the Novato Narrows has taken 20+ years! Nothing should proceed until CalTrans is on board with a plan and dollars committed!	Email	х	x						х		x		х				
Novato, Unincorporated	We live in unincorporated Novato and the consensus of my neighborhood is that we do not wish to have our area re-zoned to accommodate low-income housing. What's unique about our area is that we still have some room to support the local wildlife and insects. Since moving here in 2014, we've witnessed a decline in the bee, bumblebee, and butterfly populations. The Monarchs will soon be gone too due to dwindling food resources. They are key to the health of our ecosystem, and every time a property is developed for housing, the plants needed to support these creatures are destroyed. Fencing also hurts the trails and pathways necessary for the animals to get much-needed food and water. We do not want you re-zoning anything. We want to keep our neighborhoods as they are. We already struggle with water issues. Please do not make our areas more accessible for development. We do not want what little beauty is left here destroyed.	Email										x			х			

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL  Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanital owlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x			x					×	×		х			х	
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level of Service – LOS "F" of Local Roadways: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	X		x		X	x	x	x	X	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		×	x	x	x		×		x	x	x	х	x	x	×		
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					х			х				
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. Given the County's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals is completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10), 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative Investment: Eliminate corporate ownership	Email																
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	I am in complete support of all the points made in Sustainable Tam Almonte letter of 2/24/22. Building in the proposed area is ill advised, and appears to be illegal.	Email								х	х							
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	×	х	×	x		х		х	х	х	×	×	Х	Х		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL					1	, ,											
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingo Rd. he site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than pr	Email				x		×			x							
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				х					х			Х				
O - 217 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodríguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)—that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				х					х	х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	(Comment edited for length) Please find attached the San Geronimo Valley Planning Group's response to the proposed Housing Element update. Background: The San Geronimo Valley Planning Group was formed in 1972 to help elect Gary Giacomini to the Board of Supervisors in order to gain the critical third vote necessary to kill the 1961 Countywide Master Plan, which had envisioned 5,000 new homes and 20,000 additional residents for the San Geronimo Valley alone. While the plan was updated in 1982 and 1997, its central premise has never changed: preserving our Valley's rural character and protecting our natural environment. This commitment - along with that of many other community members - also helped permanently preserve more than 2,300 acres of open space in our beloved Valley. We have been trying to apprehend the efforts of Marin County to meet the state- mandated 'housing elements' through the rezoning of existing parcels. We are very concerned that few Valley residents are aware of the potential impact of this housing mandate on our community and that the Planning Group was not included in the process from the beginning. Apparently, pressure from the State has made it a top-down County effort. The Planning Group adamantly opposes the proposed, potential locations within our community identified below. High school property - We are alarmed by Candidate Housing Site P, the proposal to build 98 above-moderate-income units through rezoning the high school property ent to the Ottolini/Flanders' Ranch at the bottom of White's Hill on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Our Community Plan clearly spells out that the use of this property should remain as agriculture or open space, the high school district agreed. Our reasons are numerous. 1. It would be a visual blight, destroying not only the aesthetics of the entrance to our Valley but also jamming suburbia into the inland rural corridor. 2. It would be a visual blight, destroying not only the aesthetics of the entrance to our Valley but also jamming suburbia into the inland rur				×	x	x			х		х					x	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	1: can we use the Lagunitas school parcel that is before the Spirit Rock parcel? 2: If Spirit Rock is built on can it be hidden from road? 3: The visual view when you enter the Valley is gorgeous and should be maintained. 4: Lagunitas school campus has lots of unused space.	Email										х						Х
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	98 houses on the San Geronimo Valley floor is a terrible idea. It would ruin the beauty of the valley which Valley residents have worked so hard over the years to preserve. Please help us we would be most grateful if you could find other sites for these needed homes. Grateful for your attention to this.	Email								х		х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	_															
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Already leaving here is problematic early in the morning and many folks work and go to school over the hill and have to go then. You would be adding probably 200 or so cars to the problem for starters. As it is I no longer go to Point Reyes on the weekends because its an extremely busy place full of tourists and the locals cant park and get to services. Dennis, I have written to you before regarding the San Geronimo Valley Golf Course and you can see now that what was once a beautiful sward of land full of animals and birds and yes golfers is now a sea of weeds and fallen trees. And yes, people walk there on the paths and I guess through the tick invested grasses as well. And now you want to put up 98 (!) houses and destroy another piece of the Valley? And what about fire and earthquake considerations. If that corridor gets blocked in an emergency we would all try to get out through Lucas Valley or perhaps Highway One but regardless its scary to think of those situations. And I was here when we fought to keep that high school and all the other developments a NO GO. Successfully might I add and I believe the plan states that land was to stay agricultural. And how are you going to get all those folks home insurance? I already know people who have been denied coverage here and several of those companies I believe want to leave California altogether. Surely you can find another spot to meet whatever criteria is mandated some place else. I dont know if you even bother to read these letters but I do want to go on record objecting wholeheartedly to this.	Email /				х						х		x				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Dear Mr. Rodini please do your best to represent the better interest of all Valley residents and don't let 98 new houses be Built-in the area East of Woodacre along San Francisco Drake. The San Geronimo Valley has one road in-and-out and Our septic systems and fire protection issues are at stake! Please say no!	Email				х								х	х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Hello Dennis, I am writing as a long term resident in Woodacre with some concern regarding the 50 acre parcel alongside SFD Blvd and the Flanders ranch property. Please include all San Geronimo residents in any planning that might go forward on this horrendous possibility for 98 homes. We are already struggling with water issues, septic issues, road access in emergencies, current Fairfax traffic jams. We already have a valley floor jammed with County infrastructure - water dept, fire dept, PGE substation, noise and lights all times of day and night. I certainly hope this possibility will become part of many public forums on your agenda for this small and fragile valley. Since the last fire on White's Hill, nothing has been done to remove the battery box from the long-broken highway sign which may have sparked that fire. I think, in speaking to my neighbors, the SGV feels a bit neglected by your office and I sincerely hope that can be rectified.	Email				х				x				x	x			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I am a homeowner in Woodacre since 1972. I am of the opinion that there are some places that shouldn't be developed. I include all of western Marin in that category, but for the moment I will comment on the proposed development of 98 homes just west of White Hill on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Entering the valley, one's first impression is the beautiful rural landscape that is becoming rare in California. That experience would be negatively impacted by any development in that area. 98 Homes would mean around 200 automobiles adding to the congestion in Fairfax and San Anselmo and create a great deal more air pollution than already exists. That area is not only a seasonal wetland, but is in the headwaters of the Lagunitas Creek Watershed. Construction and habitation of that area would cause irreparable harm to wildlife, including endangered salmonids and many other species. I support development along the 101 corridor.	Email				х				х		х		х	х			Ì
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I am a resident and homeowner in Forest Knolls, where I live with my husband and 5 year old. I'm responding to signs I saw posted today along SFD near Dickson Ranch, in regard to the building of 98 homes on that property. I have searched online and cannot find any more information about this proposal. I would like to add my comment that you please proceed very cautiously—while I really recognize the need for more housing and more affordable housing in Marin, I have a couple of big concerns—environmental impact (including air quality, native species habitat preservation and restoration, and light pollution. I also have some concern about SFD as the only way into and out of the valley, in case of emergency (and, just in terms of general traffic congestion, and air pollution). So my comment is to please very carefully consider these matters before proceeding. Thank you!	Email				х						х		Х		Х		
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I am dead set against the proposal to develop 98 new houses on the 50 acre High School property. Such a large development is exactly the kind of change the valley has fought against for decades. Such a large development would change the Valley's pastoral character enormously and negatively. I believe the Valley's population stands around 3,500. If 4 people were to live in each house of such a new village, the valley's population would increase over 10% overnight. I would support fewer than half such units of low-income housing if they were located in dispersed fashion, and wouldn't have such a negative aesthetic consequences.	Email								х		х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I believe West Marin has reached its carrying capacity for new homes, especially in regards to water, roads, septic and fire safety. Are we going for maximum buildout? What happens after we add 3500 homes the State of California tells we have to do? What happens in 2031 when they say we have to do it again? I watched the zoom meeting with Leelee Thomas on February 16, and she said it's either the carrot or the stick. I did not see any carrots in the equation, only threats. The proposed 98 houses in the heart of the San Geronimo Valley is an ill conceived proposal. It does not take into consideration that the plot of land is the headwaters of the Lagunitas Creek which is a coho salmon nursery. It's a flood plain when we get substantial rain - if you have ever driven by in a downpour, the entire area is a web of small streams before it gets to the main stream channel about 500 feet from there. I believe the infrastructure needed for those houses would not only be an eyesore, but also a detriment to our fragile ecosystem.	Email		х		х				х	х	х		x	х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I could not access the Balancing Site work area so I am submitting these comments here. SGV is am amazing place to be due to low development. I have had the benefit of living here 25 years. What is being proposed in both of the areas of the School property and at the Gold Course are for higher end homes. Higher end homes are not a help for our community. We need homes for families with kids, We need Senior housing. We don't need another 127 above moderate income homes. Have some vision. Create a place with a grocery store, deli, and place for people to meet. Create Senior housing. Have ability to share vehicles. This area could become a hub for our community to use and support. It is also a sensitive environmental area. It used to be where water would spread out when it rained and slowly sink into the ground providing water all year round for the fish. More concrete and asphalt = more runoff. This vision of 98 separate high end homes here is not fitting to the rural area of our valley. It is just going to bring in more people who want a rural lifestyle from other areas and NOT give our locals homes. Every day, people, and families are looking for homes. Renters are being pushed out. It is unaffordable to live here. Solve the problem we have now, housing for our locals. Not bring more people here. Also, the place being considered at 6900 Sir Francis Drake is a privately owned place. Owned by a family that owns quite a bit of property in the Valley as it is. I certainly hope public monies are not going to rehab this property.									х		х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character and the beauty we prize in that view shed. I support seeking alternative Valley sites not visible from Sir Francis Drake Blvd to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I believe many of these West Marin sites are not strategic due to environmental concerns, lack of local jobs, and inadequate infrastructure to sustain such a population increase. I support seeking alternative Marin sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email		х	х					х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations. We are already working to provide affordable housing for people here in the San Geronimo Valley. Please work with our group to create homes and units that are an integral part of our existing villages. Continue to preserve our open, agricultural spaces and the green belt that surrounds this rural part of Marin county.	Email								х		×					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative sites to meet our affordable housing obligations. Supervisor Rodon: You have been a supporter of the environment and the agg culture of Marin. I know we need housing in Marin, but this is the wrong spot for 98 houses especially without any transit options for residents in that development.	Email						Х		х		х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do NOT support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Ido not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do NOT support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do NOT support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. Not to mention the massive increase in traffic and fire hazard/danger such a development would create. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations.	Email				Х				х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I do not support new housing on the 50-acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. This important rural gateway property to the valley and nearby Pt Reyes National Seashore should remain in agricultural use as part of the historical Flanders Ranch. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations. Our community will vigorously oppose such inappropriate development.	Email								х		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I hate to hear that 98 houses are going to be built on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. I do support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations, and hope that some compromise can be reached that won't destroy the beautiful approach to West Marin or further stress our limited resources. I know we are lucky to have remained untouched by "progress" for so long but oh boy I hope our luck holds a bit longer. Anything you can do to stop this unwelcome and depressing development will be much appreciated.	Email								х		Х			х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I have lived in Woodacre for over 40 years. I love the contry feel and woodsy environment. I highly object to the proposed low income housing development on Flanders property. I am your constituent, and voted for you when you were running for office. Please stop any expansion, re-zoning or building projects that will bring more residences to the Valley. I travel down San Geronimo Valley drive every day as, I work in San Rafael. When I get to the corner of Sir Francis Drake, I would be looking at the very piece of land across SFD, that the houses will be built on. As I understand the proposal, 100 houses will be built on 50 acres. The new development will also add to traffic on SFD by quite a bit. Please, let's keep the beautiful rural nature of the Valley as it is now.					х				x		x						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I hope you're well and please allow me to begin by thanking you for your leadership on a range of issues important to San Geronimo Valley residents. While I know the recent report about possible locations for additional housing in the county is quite preliminary (and conducted by a third party that does not speak for Marin County residents), it makes sense that concerned citizens speak loudly and early on this topic. Please know that I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre high school property facing Sir Francis Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character. It would destroy the beauty we prize in coming over White's Hill. It would create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. Most important, it would add a possible 200 additional vehicles and possibly up to one thousand daily vehicle trips in and out of the valley to an already congested road. Anyone trying to get to Highway 101 at 8:00 am already knows that the traffic is horrible as you enter Fairfax. This would add to that exponentially. Anyone living on or near SFD Blvd. knows that the weekends are equally tough with many tourists heading to and from the coast. While I support affordable housing I believe there are better ways and better locations to accomplish this.	Email				х				х		х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I just want to add my voice to ask you not to support the new San Geronimo housing being considered. The environmental and infrastructure impact will be horrible!	Email		Х								х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I oppose 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo ValleyWest Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.	Email				x				x		х		х	х		х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I oppose a housing development the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. 1. West Marin is maxed out on development because of fire concerns, small roads, septic. 2. The proposed development at the west side of whites hill is the headwaters of the Lagunitas creek which is our coho salmon nursery. It's a floodplain and is unsuitable for development. 3. The infrastructure needed for a development would harm our fragile ecosystem. 4.Building would ruin agricultural, rural beauty which is so precious to the San Geronimo Valley. 5. If Marin County decides to do what the State is demanding, then why not put the entire buildout on the St. Vincents property which is right next to the freeway and could handle the increase in population. We would like to see all the building be for homeless and low income people - like all the people who commute from Vallejo and Richmond to serve us daily because they can not afford to live in our county. Or work with the state to move San Quentin out to a more appropriate place for a prison such as barren land in the dessert, and make a beautiful development on the waterfront right next to shops and the ferry and the Richmond Bridge which would be easy access to transportation and would not overburden Sir Francis Drake which is already far too congested. Many other properties in Marin would be more suitable.					х				х	х	х		х	х			
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I support adding housing in appropriate locations. I do not believe the west side of White's Hill, on Tamalpais School property is appropriate. The area is prone to flooding and is vital for supporting the flow of water in the creeks that are used by salmon. Also, the county plan has been to add housing on the 101 corridor, leaving west Marin rural. As a member of the Valley Emergency Response Team, I am concerned about adding so many more cars on the road, ensuring a bottleneck in the event of an emergency evacuation.	Email									х	х		х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I support adding housing in appropriate locations. I do not believe the west side of White's Hill, on Tamalpais School property is appropriate. The area is prone to flooding and is vital for supporting the flow of water in the creeks that are used by salmon. Also, the county plan has been to add housing on the 101 corridor, leaving west Marin rural. As a member of the San Geronimo community, I am concerned about adding so many more cars on the road, ensuring a bottleneck in the event of an emergency evacuation.	Email									х	х		х				
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I think that the proposed low cost housing sites and sizes and the solution is not thought out! For instance, the 98 homes in Woodacre would create a huge traffic problem and also be inappropriate. The Olema location and proposal would ruin the nature of Olema! And Dennis Rodoni lives in Olema! The west Marin area has been protected for a reason! The nature and small town is the reason that we are all here! I've lived here for 46 years and believe that it would be more appropriate to absorb the housing on properties that are all ready developed and make it attractive for homeowners to build ADUs Please revise the thinking around this important topic of affordable housing!	Email				x				x		х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I'm not sure if this is accurate, but we have heard a site for 98 new homes is being proposed at the base of Whites Hill. We can only hope this is not true as that would be disastrous for the area and environment, and truly spoil the natural surroundings	Email										Х						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	It has come to my attention, either from neighborly chats or from other sources, there is a potential plan taking shape to add housing to the San Geronimo Valley. Specifically close to 100 houses on the land we refer to as "Flander's Field", where there was once a plan for a high school. That plan didn't materialize, as this valley began to be more declarative and assertive in stating the vision for this area, and guidelines for what is / is not acceptable development. When I moved to the valley 25 years ago, I thought it might be a place to stay for a couple of years. But after understanding this community better, and listening to our elders, I came to understand and appreciate what our environmental advocates have been fighting for and diligently guarding. This is the reason I still live here today. In my home town, I watched as the cherry trees toppied, the apple orchards fell, and the planting fields gave way to urbanization and development. It still breaks my heart whenever I drive through and see the Police Station, Post Office, County Buildings and parking lots where I once played with my friends and frolicked with my dog. I am filled with such gratitude to live here in the San Geronimo Valley, comforted in knowing this place is truly special. Magical. I now take up the fight to preserve our natural beauty and the ecosystems that depend on limits to growth. My neighbor refers to entering the valley as the "Chitty Bang Bang effect", where the wheels of the car roll up under you and you start to float along in the last part of your journey home. Please help us keep this natural beauty as opposed to a Shitty Shitty first impression entering this sacred place. Also, this would impact and devastate what little is left of our natural habitat for spawning salmonI've witnessed and taken part in many debates and county board meetings to force the stoppage of building homes due to this deleterious impact. 98 homes will be a huge battle, but taking a cue from our long term residents, environmental groups, and ou	Email										x						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Please don't approve this development! It is way too big and is in a terrible location. It will destroy the beautiful view that every Valley resident welcomes on their return home to the SG Valley. Yes we need some affordable housing, but not on this parcel, and not at market rate. The Sir Francis Drake corridor in San Geronimo should remain rural. This huge development would create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village.	Email								х		х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Please don't support the development of 98 units on former Flanders Ranch land in the San Geronimo Valley. This site stands at the gateway to the SGV and the headwaters of the watershed which houses our endangered salmonids. It is an especially sensitive location, both aesthetically and ecologically, and should be protected from all development. Just a couple of years ago, you and the BOS attempted to do a very good thing for Marin County and the SGV by purchasing the golf course, in order to protect it permanently from development and to give endangered salmonid populations a place to recover. Probably, in a few years' time, some public entity—possibly Marin County—will resume the pursuit of these goals when TPL sells the land. If the County allows a new village of several hundred people to be built, with all the ecological disturbance that entails, just a short distance upstream from the salmonid sanctuary, it will jeopardize this important environmental restoration project. I believe the 98 units are envisioned to be targeted to buyers of "above moderate" income. If so, then this suggests that the homes will be too expensive to count as the sort of affordable housing that the voting public sympathizes with. We don't want a SGV that is even more exclusive (economically speaking) than it already is—especially not at the expense of the ecology, aesthetics, etc. Please do all you can to keep the old Flanders Ranch area completely open and agricultural. Thank you very much.	Email										х					х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Please understand that our history and values are not supportive of mass development in the San Geronimo Valley. We value our rural character for aesthetic reasons but equally for safety. We must protect egress for fire primarily. In addition we do not have the infrastructure and resources to support 98 new homes. This ideal would be better served along the 101 corridor. Thank you for consideration of supporting no development of the open fields adjacent to Flander's property.	Email		х						Х		х		Х				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL								_		1							
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	Remove the high school site from any consideration for housing. It is not supported in our Community Plan (see excerpts below). In addition, this is the critical view shed that every Valley resident experiences and "welcomes" on their return "home" to the San Geronimo Valley as they negotiate the curve, going west, at the bottom of White's Hill leaving the eastern urbanized corridor (where over 90% of Marin residents live), behind. This priceless Valley view encompasses the entire Ottolini/Flanders ranch and the Spirit Rock Meditation Center property from the meadows on the flats, to the uplands and ridge that seems to disappear going west towards the Nicasio pass. High School Site Issues: The development currently proposed would create the equivalent of a "new" village and its location next to SF Drake Blvd. would destroy the Valley's rural character. Increased traffic would overwhelm Drake Blvd. in route to and from the eastern urbanized corridor and 101. The north east section of San Geronimo Creek, which is home to coho salmon and steelhead trout, appears to be in this area. If confirmed, protection of this area could impact proposed development. FYI - Historically, this 50 acre school site was originally owned by the Ottolin/Flanders Ranch family. It was condemned for use of a planned High School part of the '61 Master Plan calling for 20,000 residents and 5000 homes. This '61 Master Plan was scuttled in 1972/73 after the newly elected Board of Supervisors voted to adopt the new County Wide Plan. Subsequently, the BOS began the development of highly successful Community Plans for designated areas in West Marin. At one point, (the '80's I think) the Tamalpais school board considered selling it's 3 unused school sites. Two were in the eastern corridor and one was in the Valley. The board appointed a committee to study the situation and make a recommendation. It was composed of Kate Blickhahn (Drake High School Superintendent), Dale Elliott of Forest Knolls and me. They implemented our recommendation to se	Email				×				×		x						
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	The proposed 98 new houses on the 50 acre parcel in the San Geronimo Valley was just brought to my attention. I am not opposed to more housing, but I am opposed to how and where they will be built i(n a cluster creating a new community as well as changing the landscape as you enter The Valley). There have been other projects in the past that are woven into the existing communities. The low cost neghborhood next to the Trailer park is a fine example. I am assuming that this Federal money is to be used for our lower income population? I have lived in the Valley for 50 years at which time we voted against sewer lines and natural gas in order to keep housing developments from taking place. Will a project this large take that into consideration? I will be sure to be adding my input as this project moves forward. Dennis, as old acquaintance I'm hoping that we can find time to discuss this more, I am no longer 'asleep at the wheel'Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration.	Email		х						х		х			х		х	
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This is a terrible idea! I can tell you that it will become another problem like Victory Village. You can't just plunk down a totally different community (with different needs and mind-sets) inside another unique community. And what about water !??!?!?!! I do not support 98 houses on the 50 acre High School property facing Drake Blvd. in the San Geronimo Valley. It would destroy our Valley's rural character, the beauty we prize in that view shed and create a new, unnecessary and unwanted village. I support seeking alternative Valley sites to meet our affordable housing obligations	Email								х		х						ĺ
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	This proposal make no sense for multiple valid reasons. Please do what you can to reject it.	Email								х								
P - 4900 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	While I support adding housing in WMarin, I believe the White Hill location is not appropriate for the reasons below: This clearly goes against our Community Plan. It is an area prone to flooding As a result of the above, it interferes with the watershed that provides the creeks that support the endangers steelhead. It will place untold stress on an already precarious road evacuation during wildfire season. the Valley is already under major stress with failing septics, with no help on the horizon as has been blocked by the Planning Group. The Valley and it's homeowners are about to be handcuffed by the new stream side ordinances, making repairs and maintenance near impossible, so the added burden of 68 homes is such a double standard. The rural character of the Valley will be visually destroyed. I am curious why this information has been held from the public and the very short window of public comment which further punctuates your desertion, the same way you mid-handled the Golf Course debacle. Please respond with a confirmation of my very strong objection to this location.	Email								x	x	x						
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	(Comment edited for length) Please find attached the San Geronimo Valley Planning Group's response to the proposed Housing Element update. Background: The San Geronimo Valley Planning Group was formed in 1972 to help elect Gary Giacomini to the Board of Supervisors in order to gain the critical third vote necessary to kill the 1981 Countywide Master Plan, which had envisioned 5,000 new homes and 20,000 additional residents for the San Geronimo Valley alone. While the plan was updated in 1982 and 1997, its central premise has never changed: preserving our Valley's rural character and protecting our natural environment. This commitment - along with that of many other community members - also helped permanenently preserve more than 2,300 acres of open space in our beloved Valley. We have been trying to apprehend the efforts of Marin County to meet the state- mandated "housing elements" through the rezoning of existing parcels. We are very concerned that few Valley residents are aware of the potential impact of this housing mandate on our community and that the Planning Group adamantly opposes the proposed, potential locations within our community identified below. High school property - We are alarmed by Candidate Housing Site P, the proposal to build 98 above-moderate-income units through rezoning the high school property next to the Ottolini/Flanders' Ranch at the bottom of White's Hill on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. Our Community Plan clearly spells out that the use of this property should remain as agriculture or open space; the high school district agreed. Our reasons are numerous. 1. It would be a visual blight, destroying not only the aesthetics of the entrance to our Valley but also jamming suburbia into the inland rural corridor. 2. It would be a dangerous location, creating a separate enclave with an entrance of a very busy highway, and removing one of the few places where traffic can safely pass slower traffic. 3. Because this property is not within the boundaries of any of our four villages, it would destr				×	x	х			х		х					x	
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	1: can we use the Lagunitas school parcel that is before the Spirit Rock parcel? 2: If Spirit Rock is built on can it be hidden from road? 3: The visual view when you enter the Valley is gorgeous and should be maintained. 4: Lagunitas school campus has lots of unused space.	Email										х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1	1		1	1				1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I could not access the Balancing Site work area so I am submitting these comments here. SGV is am amazing place to be due to low development. I have had the benefit of living here 25 years. What is being proposed in both of the areas of the School property and at the Gold Course are for higher end homes. Higher end homes are not a help for our community. We need homes for families with kids, We need Senior housing. We don't need another 127 above moderate income homes. Have some vision. Create a place with a grocery store, deli, and place for people to meet. Create Senior housing. Have ability to share vehicles. This area could become a hub for our community to use and support. It is also a sensitive environmental area. It used to be where water would spread out when it rained and slowly sink into the ground providing water all year round for the fish. More concrete and asphalt = more runoff. This vision of 98 separate high end homes here is not fitting to the rural area of our valley. It is just going to bring in more people who want a rural lifestyle from other areas and NOT give our locals homes. Every day, people, and families are looking for homes. Renters are being pushed out. It is unaffordable to live here. Solve the problem we have now, housing for our locals. Not bring more people here. Also, the place being considered at 6900 Sir Francis Drake is a privately owned place. Owned by a family that owns quite a bit of property in the Valley as it is. I certainly hope public monies are not going to rehab this property.	Email								х		x					х	
R1 - 5800 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (San Geronimo Valley)	I just want to add my voice to ask you not to support the new San Geronimo housing being considered. The environmental and infrastructure impact will be horrible!	Email		х								х						
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Future Housing Sites in Marin County. I attended the local Housing meeting regarding Santa Venetia and Los Ranchitos on February 15th and live in the Santa Venetia area. Here are my comments from a Santa Venetia resident perspective: 1. The process, while advised by the Marin County Planning Department, is being run by a consulting agency that is not familiar with Marin County and the local areas & neighborhoods. 2. The number of assigned housing units to Santa Venetia, 422, ignores the following. Before housing site numbers are assigned and accepted, a "CEQA-lite" analysis should be performed to determine if the numbers and locations are practical from a CEQA perspective. We heard these concerns brushed off with the response that if any development is going to be done, a full CEQA would be completed before development could/would proceed. This would be an "after-the-fact" process, with the fact that the housing numbers and sites have already been assigned and accepted, and would be too late to be influential in the development process. a. There is only one practical vehicle road out of Santa Venetia to the freeway that is already heavily impacted by three schools, the one at the JCC, the Marin School, and Venetia Valley school, and a large pre-school. Traffic in & out of Santa Venetia is also already heavily impacted by the JCC, the Civic Center traffic, the Marin Lagoon traffic, the Veterans Memorial traffic, the Marin Lagoon Housing and the commercial enterprises along McInnis Parkway. b. Some of the sites selected are in wetlands areas, such as the McPhail school site next to North San Pedro Road. c. some of the sites selected are next to the Bay and subject to special development restrictions, such as the McPhail school site. d. The total number of housing units assigned to Marin County, and not just to the unincorporated areas, does not take into account the water needs. And we, Marin County as serviced by MMWD, are in the middle of a water shor	Email				x				x				x	х			
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Here in Santa Venetia, we are living with water shortages, traffic congestion, and our community's evacuation route was named the most dangerous in Marin and yet huge additional numbers of housing are proposed for this flood prone neighborhood. That's insane! We are not fooled by claims that these new residents won't drive everywhere. They will. We already know that every person of driving age in our neighborhood not only drives but owns a car, or truck. They line our streets, further restricting access routes. There are sites where housing can happen like at Northgate Mall, but not in our overcrowded flood zone.	Email				х				x	х			x				
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	lam a longtime resident of Santa Venetia in unincorporated Marin County, and a member of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA). I, along with many of my neighbors, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting on the Housing Element initiative, which seems detached from the reality of worsening climate change. Much of Santa Venetia exists in a flood plain; other parts are in the WUI. With only a single one-lane route in and out of the neighborhood — North San Pedro Road — our existing infrastructure is already stretched to the breaking point with daily traffic congestion restricting both egress and ingress. We currently have fewer than 1800 residences in Santa Venetia eventually experiments of approximately 25%. Adding a fraction of 422 units to Santa Venetia would greatly compromise the safety of its residents, in addition to degrading quality of life. Many of our homes were built in the WUI. We are at constant risk of wildfire, with unstable hillsides that in recent years have collapsed onto North San Pedro Road. Like all of our Marin neighbors, we are constrained by drought. Here in Santa Venetia, our water supply comes from tanks that are sited in the WUI. Supplanting CEQA review in the drive to create multi-million-dollar homes puts our cultural as well as our natural environment at risk. For example, Oxford Valley, a known site of native tribal artifacts such as shell mounds, has been designated for 45 "above moderate income" units. Bypassing CEQA would eliminate the protection of cultural resources here and in other areas of Santa Venetia and Marin that have not yet been surveyed and would be lost forever. Our neighborhood is known to be at sever risk of flooding. The SVNA is currently participating in a collaboration between the California Dept of Parks and Rec, The County of Marin, and The SF Bay NERR to "Identify and Evaluate Sea Level Rise Adaptation Options to Solve Road Flooding in China Camp State Park." The project recently received a \$525k grant to address the critical issue of flooding in t	Email		×		×				x	×	×	x	×	x			
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I am against the proposed units on North San Pedro Road. This proposed project is completely unsustainable and not researched for undesirable living situations. There are many factors that indicate this would not be a good site to build. Factors such as flood control, sea rising at a rate we can expect in the coming years, congestion, removal of a ball park and mostly there are no services to support this project. Well thought out projects include parks, services, bike paths, sidewalks and a reasonable egress in case of fire. North San Pedro Road is all ready congested due to a large school and many churches on this road. Another road to San Rafael is available to Point San Pedro Road however this road is falling due to floods in the winter and very evident sink holes that are not being addressed. More traffic would of course erode the roads further and in the past have had slides on this road particularly after recent tree removal has increased the likely occurance.	Email		x	x	х				х	х	х		х				

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I attended the zoom meeting a few nights ago. I share the concern of some of my neighbors, well articulated by Gina Hagen. While I totally support affordable housing (so question if this will be "affordable" for working class people), I think we already have too many high density buildings on San Pedro Road, Joc, school, rest homes, elder affordable housing, civic center etc So I would support maybe 25 more units or something manageable, but hundreds seems like asking for trouble in an emergency. I live on Labrea way and I am glad we have housing for families, down the street, but a common problem is the amount of cars and high occupancy of some of the apartments. The overflow of cars goes all the way to Rosal, and currently I have had cars parked in front of my house for a month and more. It is not a significant problem in my case, but my neighbor who has teenagers with cars, is having to struggle to park their own cars, while the overflow is from housing two blocks away. Obviously San Rafael is a good place for more housing and i would think a place closer to the freeway like Marin Square could be used for extra units of housing. I also would personally like to build an accessory unit in my front yard for a student, teacher, medical professional, at affordable rate. It would be nice to have a department in Marin county who could help seniors like myself design, get permits, and loans to afford to create such units. I myself was a renter in Marin for 36 years and lived in in-law apartments. I found it much more private and a win/win solution for the owner, typically older retired person, and myself as young professional. I was excited about an organization called Lily Pads and attended a meeting but found out later the owner was no longer providing services. So this would be a great thing to promote. Thank you for including us in your work. Hope we can have more affordable housing, while preserving the safety of our neighborhoods.	Email					x			x							x	
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I served on the Santa Venetia Community Plan (SVCP) Committee for almost 10 years, including working with County Staff the last 4 years, until its final adoption in 2017. This process included a thorough survey of our neighbors who commented on every empty parcel and open space for future development (and in fact Godbe told us the response was overwhelming with a higher than normal percentage of participation). Our SVCP Committee Members represented every comer of Santa Venetia. We held community meetings (that were well-attended) so all residents had a chance to voice their opinions and ideas. No one knows Santa Venetia better than Santa Venetians. The plan was supposed to cover everything of interest to ensure a diverse, family-oriented, and happy community for years to come. Adding 442 units is simply untenable for a small, working-class hamlet such as Santa Venetia. The last two open spaces (two ball fields) are slated for high density housing. This is totally uncharacteristic of the surrounding neighbors who live in small, single-family housing. In the February 15th Housing Element Zoom call, with County Staff and Contractors from who knows where?, we were informed that our Community Plan would need to be updated. Who would do this work? When and how soon would these updates happen? How can the County randomly update our Community Plans that we spent so many resources on. SB-9 and SB-10 are a complete contradiction to our Community Plan that we dedicated years of work and volunteer hours to finally see its adoption. These past summers, we've stayed inside due to smoke and/or triple-digit weather. We used a bucket from our shower to water our indoor and deck plants while our yard withered and died due to restrictions and requirements in place from Marin Water. We worked out evacuation routes to lader residents to becaye danger due to our one road in and out of Santa Venetia. I heard chain saws, chippers, and weed whackers almost every day, regardless of the high, fire-danger days. This is due to San Rafa	Email									×			x	×			
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	I will reiterate the comments I made at the February 15 Housing Element meeting I've lived in SV for over 30 years. I've served on the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association Board of Directors for almost 30 years. Through our neighborhood association, The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA), we try to get the word out so that our residents are aware of upcoming projects and opportunity to comment. We've heard from Santa Venetia residents that they want to protect our quality of life. We are already concerned about the constant fire danger, flooding, Sea Level Rise, ingress and egress, and unsafe evacuation routes. Climate change is a huge concern for us and as well, we have run out of water in Marin County and are under strict mandates, so I can't understand how adding more and more housing units will help. And to restate, 422 units in SV is an increase of almost 25% of the 1,700-1,800 units we currently had, at last count. It's a very shocking number of additional units for us. I grew up in San Rafael. I hate what they've done to the City and have been constantly disappointed with the building choices and what they have given up. I don't want to see that happening in Santa Venetia — more congestion and loss of our green spaces. Affordable housing sounds great on paper, but we never seem to get that promise fulfilled. I've followed projects in San Rafael and for almost every project, the promise is a huge amount of housing with a small portion designated affordable and then after the project passes through the hurdles, the affordable-housing number is adjusted always downward. I remember previously rules were passed to keep up with the demand of affordable housing, but the goalposts seem to constantly change and that number is lowered. What is the promise that won't happen with this process? Also, I heard them say at that meeting, they were giving schools and churches more flexibility by allowing them to build on parking lots? If that is the case, where will people park? They've already lowered	Email								x	×	x		x	×		x	

Location	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R10 - 200 San Pedro Road (Santa Venetia)	Re: Marin County Housing and Safety Elements Update, 2023 – 2031. The Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association (SVNA) is an organization representing the interests of 1,700 – 1,800 households (4,474 residents per the 2019 census figures) who live in Santa Venetia. As an organization, we are dedicated to the enhancement and preservation of the character and quality of life of the Santa Venetia neighborhood. We do our best to represent our community and have an established reputation to be a voice for proper development. And in accordance with our mission statement, we, the Board Members of the SVNA, feel compelled to comment on this issue. We want to ensure that the Marin County Board of Supervisors receives an accurate impression from our community regarding the updated Housing Element and are writing today to summarize feedback we have heard from many of our members. Many residents of Santa Venetia, including members of the SVNA, attended the February 15 Zoom meeting where consultants representing the interests of the housing element initiative presented online tools for community feedback. We find these tools inadequate; rather nacerving an open platform for the BOS to receive realistic community input, they seem designed to provide information to housing element staff as to where to add more housing. The Housing Element recommends 422 additional units for Santa Venetia. There are currently fewer than 1,800 residences in Santa Venetia, so this represents an increase of approximately 25%— far more growth than the neighborhood has seen for at least two decades. This mandate seems utterly siloed from the worsening reality of global warming and climate change, (the existence of which was recognized both in the Countywide Plan and by the Marin County Civil Grand Jury) which is leading to catastrophic weather events such as fires and flooding. The upland parts of Santa Venetia and tirrectly threatened by flooding are part of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and are subject to year-round fire danger. Like all of Mar	Email				x				x	х			x	x		x	
R13 - 26600 State Route 1 (Tomales)	I would like to suggest an alternative site to the one listed on the east side of Hwy 1 and 1st Street in Tomales. After living in Tomales very close to 30 years, I feel the intersection there is already quite impacted due to school traffic approaching both elementary and high school, the district office traffic, our downtown businesses including bakery, deli, and general store and much weekend tourist traffic mistaking their way to Dillon Beach. I feel one or more of the sites at old high school, or further north of "hub" of town would be more suitable and would not add to the current congestion.	Email				х												
R15 -12785 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Inverness)	The proposed development and locations designated for housing in unincorporated West Marin is ill-conceived and inappropriate. This appears to be a numbers game on the part of the County and outside, contracted MIG development agency. The plan lacks consideration for or understanding of natural resources, environmental hazards and the existing community. Communities around Tomales Bay are watershed areas with drainage into the vulnerable bay, creeks and streams, the salt marshes and wildlife habitats. The site near Vladimir's restaurant, across from Dixon Marine, is directly across from Tomales Bay and almost at sea level. This area and the road can flood during a high tide or heavy rain, draining pollution into the bay. Also the proposed building would affect the small downtown of Inverness. West Marin is served by narrow, curving, two lane access roads. For Inverness there is only one road, in or out, a problem during flooding, fires, landslides and general overcrowding on weekends and holidays. These roads frequently need repair when lanes crumble into a creek, hillside or the bay. No freeways please, as was proposed in the 60s. I have lived in Inverness since the 70s. As a single working mother, a teacher, I raised my daughter in Inverness. Over the years I have seen families and friends move away as rentals, cottages and small units were converted to more lucrative Airbnbs and second homes. There are 4 houses around me with 2 units in each. Two are completely unoccupied. Two are rarely used by their absentee owners, leaving each second unit vacant. There are many houses like this in Inverness and far too many BnBs and other short term rentals. An absentee owner might purchase a house, spend an exorbitant amount of money improving it for short term rental or investment. Possible housing is currently available. West Marin already has serious problems related to climate change, as well as overcrowding, road congestion air and noise pollution from cars, sewage and, most obviously, water. Inverness is served by	Email				x					×	×		×	x			

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1				1	1 -		1		,				-		-	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	×		
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EliR and the 2012 Housing Element SelIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodpalin, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	х	x	x	x		×		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1					, ,											
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) The Tam Design Review Board is charged with focusing on and supporting the provisions of the Tamalpais Area Community Plan (TACP). In addition to laying out a description of the appropriate character of the community, this plan clearly sets forth constraints specifying that environmental hazards must be taken into account in the site selection process. Indeed, this is also cualed for the viability of the adoption of the Housing Element itself. According to step #7 of the Housing Element's Site Identification Process: "Provide in the analysis a general description of any known environmental or other features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected wetlands, oak tree preserves, very high fire hazard severity zones) that have the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites" p. 10. The TACP "places a strong emphasis on protecting the public safety and preserving the natural resources of the community, while still permitting individual property owners to realize reasonable development potentials" (pg. 1-3). This balance is more critical today than it was in 1992 when the plan was written, with the risk of chronic flooding, impending sea level rise, and fire in the wildland-urban interface presenting an ever- greater peril to our neighborhoods. Tam Valley, Almonte, Homestead Valley, and Muir Woods Park are already viable and diverse neighborhoods, containing a range of housing from high-end single family residences to affordable analyses. The provide needed housing which would have a minimal negative impact and enhance the community. The Housing Element should take a closer look at the potential for rezoning to achieve its goals. For those of lesser wealth to have a care to the amenities available in the Tam Area, in particular good schools and proximity to jobs and open space, is a noble and important goal. There are a series of recent State laws that are aimed at helping to solve the housing crisis in California. Unfortunately, in its search for a solution	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF pp. 228-231)				х					x	x		x			x	
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and precidic wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. Given the County's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative Investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of					х					x	х		x			x	
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	х	х	х	×		х		x	х	х	×	Х	x	х		

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, as assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingod. He site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than p	Email				x		x			x							
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				х					х			х				
R18 - 375 Shoreline Highway (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodríguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)-that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				x					x	x						
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would ensure and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways.: II. Ali Cyality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please follow the below link to read the comment letter by Technical Expert Matt Hagemann. VI. Endangered Special Status Species. VII. Insufficient Services & Public Tran	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	×	x		X		×	×	x	x	х	х	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R19 - Tennessee Valley Ro: (Tamalpais)	information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please follow the below link to read the comment letter by Technical Expert Matt Hagemann. VI. Endangered Special Status Species. VII. Insufficient Services & Public Transit. VIII. Historic Wetlands and Baylands Corridor. IX. Historic Marshland That Could Be Restored. 160 Shoreline Huy and 260 Redwood Hwy Frontage Rd. are historic marshland. X. High Density Development Is Not Consistent With the Traditional Character Of The Local Semi-Rural Communities. Conclusion: The County now has sufficient information to understand that the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Sites are inappropriate for inclusion in the 2023-2031 Housing Element Candidate Housing Sites Inventory. Not only would construction of housing on these sites exacerbate the already existing problems but doing so when the County admits in the Marin Countywide Plan EIR and 2012 Housing Element's FSEIR that significant adverse unavoidable impacts would result from such construction defies logic. Moreover, there can be no benefit that would override the impacts of environmental harm and severe illness, injury or loss of life from building on the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites, which are laden with environmental constraints and dangerous hazards. The best course of action would be for the County to revise the list to reflect the current problems with traffic, seismic activity, hazardous soil conditions, air and noise pollution, water supply, flooding, and impending sea level rise and to find that no new residential development in the Tam Junction & Manzanita areas is appropriate. Such action would be consistent with the Board of Supervisors' sensible decisions.	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		×		x	x	x	x	x	x	X		
R19 - Tennessee Valley Ro: (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) The Tam Design Review Board is charged with focusing on an supporting the provisions of the Tamalpais Area Community Plan (TACP). In addition to laying out a description of the appropriate character of the community, this plan clearly sets forth constraints specifying that environmental hazards must be taken into account in the site selection process. Indeed, this is also crucial for the viability of the adoption of the Housing Element's Site Identification Process: "Provide in the analysis a general description of any known environmental or other features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected wetlands, oak tree preserves, very high fre hazard severity zones) that have the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites" p. 10. The TACP "places a strong emphasis on protecting the public safety and preserving the natural resources of the community, while still permitting individual property owners to realize reasonable development potentials" (pg. I-3). This balance is more critical today than it was in 1992 when the plan was written, with the risk of chronic flooding, impending sea level rise, and fire in the wildland-urban interface presenting an ever- greater peril to our neighborhoods. Tam Valley, Almonte, Homestead Valley, and Muir Woods Park are already viable and diverse neighborhoods, containing a range of housing from high-end single family residences to affordous partments. Maintaining this diversity has long been a goal of the community, as expressed in Section I-C of the TACP. Added mixed use development in the Tam Junction area could, with proper planning and infrastructure update, provide needed housing which would have a minimal negative impact and enhance the community. The Housing Element should take a closer look at the potential for rezoning to achieve its goals. For those of lesser wealth to have access to the amentiles available in the Tam Area, in particular good schools and proximity to jobs and open space, is a noble and important g	Email (See Email Comments Received PDF, pp. 228-231)				x					x	x		×			x	

## MARIN COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT: CANDIDATE HOUSING SITES AND SELECTION PROCESS COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		1		1	1	1		,						-			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. Given the Country's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the property is arguably an investment property only, and any claim of the need for that short-term rental income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of	Email				x					x	х		х			x	
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	х	х	х	×		х		x	х	x	x	x	x	×		
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)		Email				х					х			Х				
R19 - Tennessee Valley Road (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodriguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				х					х	x						
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	I am writing to request that Strawberry site R2 be removed from potential sites for high density housing. This site is not appropriate for high density housing. The Eagle Rock neighborhood already has traffic problems, and adding units will exacerbate those issues. This particular site is in an inaccessible extreme stope. Adding high density housing to this site will also destroy the family neighborhood surrounded by open space. Please consider repurposing more urban locations instead of paying over natural landscape.	Email				х						х						
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	I live on Eagle Rock Rd. It is already congested. Traffic conditions on Tiburon Blvd at most times make it difficult to enter the Eagle Rock area. At the proposed location there is a 4 way intersection, providing access to a gas station, a multi tenant commercial building, access to N. Knoll with section 8 housing (which is very busy) and the residents and providers to my neighbors and me. The proposed site is on a steep hillside making it difficult to build. There is a bus stop at the base where N. Knoll empties onto Tiburon Blvd. This may be good for your concerns, but every day there are cars parked on lower Eagle Rock Rd. using free parking to access the bus service, many use it for longer term parking when traveling out of the area. Building more units on your proposed site will increase street parking. It always does. Your proposal will increase foot traffic crossing 4 lane Tiburon Blvd. We see pedestrians, daily, risking their lives crossing to go to Strawberry Shopping Center. Sure, there is a pedestrian crossing lane, but with the traffic they are not always visible to drivers. It's a scary operation trying to cross. The traffic entering onto Tiburon Blvd. from Hwy 101 is already congested. Then add the traffic coming up from Strawberry Shopping Center. Certain times of the day you already have to wait for more than one light to get through. It seems that California fire seasons are getting longer and more intense. We could have a real discussion on that, but that is the reality today. We are located down hill from large open spaces. Our evacuation points are in Strawberry and with massive traffic also evacuating from points toward Tiburon, it could be a real disaster. Development on this plot is not a good idea.	Email				x	х		х			х		х				
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	Please start paying attention to the organizing activities of NIMBY — Marin Against Density an anti-housing group because they are already fighting future development47 N Knoll Road where Kruger Pines Retirement home in Strawberry is located is about in the middle of this NOT COUNTY MAINTAINED Road. The part closest to where Eagle Roc and Bay Vista is in the 20s and the part closest to 70 N Knoll Road where the vacant lot is, is at the other side and Kruger Pines is in the middle. If this gets the green light for development then trucks for construction will be really destroying the road and it will take several years to get things completed too so please work on getting this road designation changed into county maintained road as part of the approval of the land development and have the whole road redone /paved when the development is completed I would love to see another senior/disabled housing development be built on this land along with workforce housing for teachers and first responders too. It would be wonderful to have this parcel developed to house more seniors born 1946-1964 and to have N Knoll Road become MAINTAINED as a county maintained road too because of all the potholes that are in the road now. I would like to submit this email letter to show my support for 70 N Knoll Road to be developed into affordable housing in the extremely low income, very low income, range of seniors 62+ who are falling into homelessness all the time now with greater frequency due to how low their social security is compared to what the rental rates are in Marin County. The teachers and first responders need housing too so please build housing for them also. 70 N Knoll Rd, Mill Valley, CA 94941   Zillow: The vacant lot last sold on 2016-10-18 for \$11,60000, with a recorded lot size of 6.12 acres	Email															х	x

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	So evidently this vacant lot is being considered for building housing and NIMBY is already out against it! Please start paying attention to the organizing activities of NIMBY – Marin Against Density an anti-housing group because they are already fighting future development. 47 N Knoll Road where Kruger Pines Retirement home in Strawberry is located is about in the middle of this NOT COUNTY MAINAINED Road. The part closest to where Eagle Roc and Bay Vista is in the 20s and the part closest to 70 N Knoll Road where the vacant lot is, is at the other side and Kruger Pines is in the middle. If this gets the green light for development then trucks for construction will be really destroying the road and it will take several years to get things completed too so please work on getting this road designation changed into county maintained road as part of the approval of the land development and have the whole road redone /paved when the development is completed. I would love to see another senior/disabled housing development be built on this land along with workforce housing for teachers and first responders too. It would be wonderful to have this parcel developed to house more seniors born 1946-1964 and to have N Knoll Road become MAINTAINED as a country maintained road too because of all the potholes that are in the road now. I would like to submit this email letter to show my support for 70 N Knoll Road to be developed into affordable housing in the extremely low income, very low income, range of seniors 62+ who are falling into homelessness all the time now with greater frequency due to how low their social security is compared to what the rental rates are in Marin County. The teachers and first responders need housing too so please build housing for them also. 70 N Knoll Road Mail Walley, CA 94941   Zillow: The vacant lot last sold on 2016-10-18 for \$11,60000, with a recorded lot size of 6.12 acres	Email															х	х
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
R2 - North Knoll Road and St. Thomas Drive (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways: .II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	X	x	x		×		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways: .II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodpian, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	х	х		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	[Comment edited for length) The Tam Design Review Board is charged with focusing on and supporting the provisions of the Tamalpais Area Community Plan (TACP). In addition to laying out a description of the appropriate character of the community, this plan clearly sets forth constraints specifying that environmental hazards must be taken into account in the site selection process. "Provide in the analysis a general description of the Housing Element Itself. According to step #7 of the Housing Element's Site Identification Process: "Provide in the analysis a general description of any known environmental or other features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected wetlands, oak tree preserves, very high fire hazard severity zones) that have the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites" p. 10. The TACP "places a strong emphasis on protecting the public safety and preserving the natural resources of the community, while still permitting individual property owners to realize reasonable development potentials" (pg. 1-3). This balance is more critical today than it was in 1992 when the plan was written, with the risk of chronic flooding, impending sea level rise, and fire in the wildland-urban interface presenting an ever-greater peril to our neighborhoods. Tam Valley, Almonte, Homestead Valley, and Muir Woods Park are already viable and diverse neighborhoods, containing a range of housing from high-end single family residences to affordable apartments. Maintaining this diversity has long been a goal of the community, as expressed in Section I-C of the TACP. Added mixed use development in the Tam Junction area could, with proper planning and infrastructure update, provide needed housing which would have a minimal negative impact and enhance the community. The Housing Element should take a closer look at the potential for rezoning to achieve its goals. For those of lesser wealth to have access to the amentiles available in the Tam Area, in particular good schools and proximity to jobs and	Email (See Email Comments Received PDF, pp. 228-231)				x					x	x		x			x	
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					Х			X				L
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	As a concerned Mill Valley resident, I am writing to endorse TamAlmonte's letter to you re. the merits of Tam Valley, Almonte, & Manzanita Draft Candidate Housing Sites. Please think very carefully about sites, due to concerns about flooding, traffic and at times extreme fore danger with needed evacuation routes.	Email				х					х			х				

# MARIN COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT: CANDIDATE HOUSING SITES AND SELECTION PROCESS COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL																	
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risk of flooding from storm surge or sea level rise. 3. Bothin Marsh: Require all new development adjacent to Bothin Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the marsh. (if when the Country's recent efforts to restore and preserve the marsh, it makes no sense to select a site adjacent to the marsh for any form of dense development. 4. Evacuations: Require that new housing development along Shoreline Highway trigger a study and redesign of the traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic impacts of emergency evacuation should include new housing developments in the City of Mill Valley, as Shoreline Highway is the only exit should East Blithedale become blocked. 5. Short Term Rentals: Eliminate short-term rentals completely, or allow only on-site, owner-occupied properties to have short-term rentals. If someone does not live on-site, then the properties to have short-term rentals income can be disregarded. This would enable ADUs to be counted toward the Housing Element numbers (see item #10). 6. Vacancies: Create a County mandated vacancy tax (as San Francisco is presently considering) to create disincentives for leaving housing units empty. Exemptions could be made for work from home or dwellings under a certain square footage if the homeowner works from home or needs the space for their own dwelling use. This has been documented to establish new housing units and therefore could be counted toward the housing numbers. 7. Speculative Investment: Eliminate corporate ownership of housing of up to 4 units. This will stop speculative vore-bid	Email				x					×	х		x			x	
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	ATTACHMENT from Tam Design Review Board: Suggested Additional Policies to be Included in the Housing Element: 1. Wildfire Risk: Use mathematical modeling to investigate and predict wildfire risk. Prohibit the building of housing (even ADUs) in fire critical areas. 2. Flood Risk: Prohibit new housing in areas at risks of flooding from storm surges or see level rise. 3. Be this Marsh: Require all fores to development algreene the Bothsh Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that are designed to preserve the mersh. 3. Be this Marsh: Require all fores to development algreene the Bothsh Marsh to supplement and follow the policies that the design of the traffic patterns to ensure the atary new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an revacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worsen traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worse traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure that any new housing development in that area will not worse traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure the any new housing development in that are a will not worse traffic or increase the threat to life safety during an evacuation. Any assessment of traffic patterns to ensure the any new housing development in that are awill not worse traffic patterns to ensure the safety and new traffic patterns t	Email				x					х	x		x			x	
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. The need for housing our homeless is desperate but building residential space at Tam Junction is just NOT logical. The idea of building along Shoreling/ Highway 1 is very questionable. It is already a populated area with minimal sidewalks and access to needed resources. Thank you for your consideration of the attached letter	Email	×	x	x	х		х		x	х	x	×	Х	×	х		
R20 - 260 Redwood Highway Frontage Road (Almonte)	The information lists only 1 Parcel, which is wrong - there are 3. It lists only 36 possible Housing units, which is wrong - it should be 36 units for Workforce or Senior units and 73 Hotel rooms, which is what the Tam Valley community Plan calls for on the larger Parcel. This site is located in the Manzanita area, not Almonte.	Email	х														х	

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	T				1	1 -		1				,		-			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density evelopment, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's Elfa and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways: II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health i	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	х	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

## MARIN COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT: CANDIDATE HOUSING SITES AND SELECTION PROCESS COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		, ,							1								
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	such emergencies. Softenine riginway in 1 and valley is where most or in the propose nousing sites to our area area to a complete standstill and result in property damage and human fatalities. We further note that steadily increasing traffic impacts on Shoreline Highway from tourism continue to aggravate all these challenging conditions. While we appliand the careful consideration of available sites by MIG, as community volunteers appointed to research and uphold the values of the Tam Plan, we cannot in good conscience support the choice of the sites within our area without: 1) A detailed study of future traffic and its impacts on evacuation through Tam Junction and the Highway 101 on-ramp; 2) A careful analysis of the impact of new, medium or high-density housing on the Bothin Marsh and the risks of chronic flooding; 3) Development of a plan for Highway 1 at Manzanita and along Shoreline Highway to accommodate imminent sea level rise; and 4) Assurances that, if there is no way to avoid selecting housing sites in the Tam Plan area for development, the resulting housing will be protected from speculative investors and the potential to remove these future developments from the long-term rental market. The Tamalpais Area is so vulnerable to climate change disasters that, frankly, unless the housing built has a direct impact on resolving the housing crisis and addressing those most in need, new development will only intensify the crises of both climate risks and affordability. We understand the mandates from the State require you to make some challenging choices in selecting housing sites. In addition to placing questions of safety and environmental stewardship at the top of your agenda, we would like to suggest that you include in the current update of the Countywide Plan some further policies that will help guide County planning in the face of both State mandates and, if and when these mandates are modified, the undesirable results that might emerge. Please see the attached detailed list of policies	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 228-231)				x					×	×		x			×	
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	I am writing to endorse the attached letter from Sustainable TamAlmonte to the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the merits of the proposed Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Marin County Housing Element DRAFT	Email	х	Х	x	x		х		х	×	×	x	Х	×	Х		
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	We are writing in regard to the sites chosen for possible inclusion into county plans for housing in the Almonte/Tam Valley area of the county. Of the eight sites mentioned in your Balancing Act scenario, five are in a serious flood zone and one is located, not on, but in Richardson's Bay. Your commentary regarding the avoidance of environmental hazards has been completely ignored by whatever staff was used to choose these sites. The properties in the flood zone are 160 Shoreline, assessor's parcel # 052-041-27, 217 Shoreline, 223 Shoreline, and 204 Flamingo Rd. he site which is actually in the bay is 260 Redwood Hwy. Oddly enough, there is one property across the road from 160 Shoreline which is on solid ground. That would be the Muir Woods Lodge, a motel which actually has some open space which could be used for more housing. Why was this property ignored when lesser properties were chosen? Considering that we are familiar with the sites in the Almonte/Tam Valley area but not the rest of the county, it seems very strange that your staff has chosen properties which flood now and will continue to flood even more in the future. We wonder about your motivation in focusing on dangerous and inappropriate land. We also wonder why your staff has chosen properties which are pretty much lumped together in the same area which will further exacerbate the level F traffic problems which occur for us every day. If these sites were chosen to be close to public transportation, we would remind you that there is no viable public transportation in our area. So we would be looking forward to much more daily auto traffic. We are extremely disappointed in the Balancing Act which appears to be a distraction and of no practical value. We wonder how much time and money was wasted on promoting this ridiculous game. We also wonder how many sites in the rest of the county are totally inappropriate but are being promoted as a way to choose our fate which, as you know, is not the case. Surely, the Board of Supervisors can do better than pr	Email				x		×			×							
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	We oppose new housing in the areas mentioned in Tam Junction due to flooding and traffic and possible fires, can't get out of here now. Tell Scott Wiener and his friends to move on.	Email				Х					Х			Х				
R21 - 204 Flamingo Road (Tamalpais)	Yesterday afternoon, I had the pleasure of speaking with Ms. Clark about the wisdom (actually, the lack of it) in the choice of potential sites around Tam Junction. Last night, I participated in the "roadshow" and, as a result, I am asking for your help in following up on one matter. During the presentation by Jose Rodriguez, he mentioned that one of the "Guiding Principles" for the BOS is the consideration of "environmental hazards". It doesn't take long to recognize the hazards of sea level rise, a long history of flooding and traffic in our neighborhood, among others. But, in addition, Mr. Rodriguez made an interesting rejoinder to a question about whether certain sites can be included in this study if such sites have been previously reviewed and rejected. He was not too clear but he suggested that the State of California has some "requirements" if a previously rejected site is again brought up for analysis. I asked him to specify (1) which of the four Tam Valley sites have already been considered and rejected, and (2) what are the state's requirements (if any)—that are different or additional—that would apply to such sites. He did not have the information available to answer either question and it didn't appear to me that there would be much of an effort to research those questions and disseminate the answers. Hence, this email. Do you know the answers? If not, would you please put in motion an effort to discover the answers? It may not be dispositive, but then again, it may be important.	Email				х					X	x						
R3 - 275 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	I wanted to share concerns about a proposed housing element on the corner of Olive avenue and Atherton (275 Olive Ave, currently a nursery). That site is a wet meadow and not an appropriate building location for a development of 50 homes. It is already subject to frequent flooding, is essentially sitting on top of a wetland nature preserve, and is basically at sea level. If you walk out there today, it is mostly under water. The inevitable sea level rise that will impact that spot makes it, and any other sites at that elevation, inappropriate for further development. Is it alright to ask why this parcel is being considered when these conditions are well known?	Email	x							х	Х	Х						
R3 - 275 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	The consideration of this site (275 Olive Avenue) raises a concern that other similarly inappropriate sites may also be up for consideration in other parts of Marin. Would it be possible to get a list of any sites that are within 500 feet of a wetland? I studied wetland habitat restoration planning in graduate school, and was under the impression that CEOA/CWA sect 404 prevented projects from being built on top of or close to wetlands.	Email										х						

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL		, ,										, ,					
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
R5 - 299 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	I am just finding out about the rezoning proposal along the Atherton corridor in Novato, and since I missed the meeting, I am writing to express my deepest concern as well as how much I am against this proposal. I live at the end of Olive Avenue, close to Atherton Ave, and have for almost 40 years. I have watched the impact just a few additional homes have had in this area. I am tremendously concerned about the wildlife, and how this proposal would jeopardize their well being. It would greatly impact their ability to access food and water. More homes means more traffic, which means more animals in danger of being struck by cars. There is already too much traffic for this corridor, and I am referring to Olive Avenue as well as Atherton Avenue. These areas cannot handle more housing! Please reconsider this proposal and keep the wildlife and our open spaces preserved.	Email				х				х		x						
R5 - 299 Olive Avenue (Blackpoint)	I am writing to express my opinion on the potential construction of hundreds of new housing units along the Atherton Avenue corridor to meet the county's state mandated housing quotas. I urge you to redirect new high-density housing to more appropriate areas with better access and infrastructure and with less adverse impacts on wildlife and existing residents: It is not sensible to add large new sources of traffic congestion directly onto Atherton Avenue, the only conduit for evacuation from surrounding neighborhoods during fire emergencies. The proposed development will impact a rich and diverse wildlife population in the area, beyond just the destruction of habitat in the footprints of new construction. Increases in road traffic, noise, and other human activity will invariably take a toil. Foxes, opossums, and raccoons regularly transit my yard at night (I live off of Atherton Ave) and the semi-rural neighborhood environment also supports deer, wild turkeys, hawks, quail, squirrels, owls, turkey vultures and other animals. These poulations are assets to the natural environment of Marin County and are all sensitive to human encroachment. The potential housing development is grossly uncharacteristic of the adjacent neighborhoods in terms of density and appearance. The proposed housing locations do not have walk-to shopping and other services, which I believe should be a top priority for siting new high-density housing. The Atherton corridor is a narrow strip with very limited road access: One way in from the west; one way in from the east, and one secondary access (Olive Ave) from the south. This situation is a natural consequence of the geographic boundaries along the corridor. Loading up this narrow space with more traffic, more parking needs, more water requirements, and more sewer infrastructure – when other options exist – does not make sense.	Email		x	×	x				x		X		X	X			
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	I live on Eagle Rock Rd. It is already congested. Traffic conditions on Tiburon Blvd at most times make it difficult to enter the Eagle Rock area. At the proposed location there is a 4 way intersection, providing access to a gas station, a multi tenant commercial building, access to N. Knoll with section 8 housing (which is very busy) and the residents and providers to my neighbors and me. The proposed site is on a steep hillside making it difficult to build. There is a bus stop at the base where N. Knoll empties onto Tiburon Blvd. This may be good for your concerns, but every day there are cars parked on lower Eagle Rock Rd. using free parking to access the bus service, many use it for longer term parking when traveling out of the area. Building more units on your proposed site will increase street parking. It always does. Your proposal will increase foot traffic crossing 4 lane Tiburon Blvd. We see pedestrians, daily, risking their lives crossing to go to Strawberry Shopping Center. Sure, there is a pedestrian crossing lane, but with the traffic they are not always visible to drivers. It's a scary operation trying to cross. The traffic entering onto Tiburon Blvd. from Hwy 101 is already congested. Then add the traffic coming up from Strawberry Shopping Center. Certain times of the day you already have to wait for more than one light to get through. It seems that California fire seasons are getting longer and more intense. We could have a real discussion on that, but that is the reality today. We are located down hill from large open spaces. Our evacuation points are in Strawberry and with massive traffic also evacuating from points toward Tiburon, it could be a real disaster. Development on this plot is not a good idea.	Email				x	x		х			х		х				
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. I am already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillsides are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-tenant housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
R7 - Eagle Rock Road (Strawberry)	The access to the Eagle Rock Road area is already very difficult. The narrow street, especially on the lower exit side, is concerning should there be more development in the area. All it takes is one truck to completely block the exit path from this area. We are already concerned about getting out safely should a fire happen in this area which has high fire potential. With the steep hill median strip (that is constantly slipping in rain storms) there is nowhere to widen the road. These steep hillistices are not a good location for additional housing, especially multi-chart housing. The current traffic backing up at the Tiburon Blvd/Blithedale exit is already a problem. Additional traffic at this location is not a good idea. Please remove sites R2 and R7.	Email				х				х				х				
San Geronimo	Comment edited for length)I attended the Wednesday evening presentation last week dealing with the State mandate for increasing housing in Marin. Clearly, you have been given a difficult task. Your introduction of the Guiding Principles and "explore strategies" was well done and appreciated. You answered most questions very well. Regreffully, time constraints didn't allow for in-depth responses and discussion. In every case, yours was the final comment and you, of necessity, moved on	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 45-47)			х							x					x	
San Geronimo	Considering putting any housing on the site of the once San Geronimo golf course is wrong. It's too far out, creating more congestion on an already congested road. It also goes against the property zoning. In case of fire, ingress and egress would be even more impacted than it is now	Email				Х								Х				

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	ı				1			1						-			
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Tam Valley / Almonte: Unknown-049-231-09-Marin Drive (3 Units)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious lilness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	x	x	x	x		×		x	x	x	x	x	x	×		
Tam Valley / Almonte: Unknown-052-041-27- Shoreline Highway (12 Units)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the uniquee characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element S SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Reis III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	х	х	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	×		

	COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL	1																
Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	ACT	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
Unknown-049-231-09-Marin Drive (3 Units) (Tam Valley / Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element IDRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's EIR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would exacerbate the existing dangerous conditions and add new significant adverse environmental impacts (which) magnifies the probability that a tragedy would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, Subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health		х	х	x	х		x		x	x	x	x	х	X	X		
Unknown-052-041-27- Shoreline Highway (12 Units) (Tam Valley / Almonte)	(Comment edited for length) Sustainable TamAlmonte has the following comments and recommendations regarding the merits of the above referenced Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita Candidate Housing Sites listed in the 2023-2031 Housing Element DRAFT Candidate Housing Sites List. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, encouraging residential development, especially high-density development, at the above referenced Sites would increase the risk of undue harm to the environment and undue hardship, illness, injury and/or death to the current and future residents. The Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita commercial lowlands, in which the above referenced sites are located, experience the most number of environmental constraints and hazards of any area in Unincorporated Marin. Both the Marin Countywide Plan's ElR and the 2012 Housing Element's SEIR demonstrate that development at these sites would ensue and the multiple mitigations that a developer would need to fulfill would cause development costs to soar. These factors make the sites unsuitable for affordable housing. The only acceptable course of action is to eliminate the sites from the inventory. Below is a list of the unique natural features, hazards, and limited resources in the Tam Valley, Almonte, and Manzanita lowlands that constrain development and population growth and substantiate our argument. For a quick overview of these constraints, please view the attached table. I. Dangerous Traffic with Unacceptable Level Of Service – LOS "F" Of Local Roadways:. II. Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain, Impending Sea Level Rise III. Filled Marsh Areas With High Seismic Activity, Liquefaction, subsidence and Mud Displacement. IV. Air Quality & Noise: Increased Risk of Residents Developing Serious Illness Due to Living Near Major Roadways. V. Hazardous Materials: For additional information regarding potential health impacts to workers and future residents who may be exposed to hazardous soil conditions, related to past uses, in Tam Junction and Manzanita, please follo	Email (See Email Comments Received.PDF, pp. 123-151)	X	X	x	x		x		x	x	×	x	X	X	X		
West Marin Coastal Area	The deadline for input is unrealistic and the tool is exceedingly difficult to use. I understand the County is under pressure to meet the State mandate, however this plan is like throwing darts at a map. It fails to address critical disaster planning in advance of determining even potential site selection. Responding to the coastal zone: I find it extremely distressing that with the impact of climate related severe fire risk, drought, resource depletion, traffic, parking, lack of sewer, emergency ingress/egress, etc., that we are considering adding increased density. The tool does not allow for pinpointing houses that sit empty, or the 600 plus vacation rentals in West Marin. I support accessibility to community based housing. If there were a severe limit placed on vacation rentals in the Coast Region, clawing back on permits/allowances, a number of livable units equal to the numbers proposed would be freed up. I have lived here for 40 plus years and have seen housing go the way of increased tourism, housing stock becoming vacation/business stock and 2nd home owners with frequently vacant homes. Until the Coastal Commission understands the risks involved to increased density and supports strict limitations to vacation units/business, the problem will persist no matter how many new units are introduced. It is unfortunate that it likely take a fire storm / evacuation disaster to illustrate the hazards compounded by sheer numbers. My cottage on the Inverness Ridge burned in 95 and the risk then was a fraction of what it is today. Driving Sir Francis Drake on a usual busy weekend, or most days during the summer, is the equivalent of coastal gridlock. Adding more units at the bottom of White's Hill, Nicasio, Point Reyes, Olema, and Inverness is placing more people in vulnerable locations trying, along with thousands of visitors, to flee during an inevitable disaster on a narrow artery. Stop vacation rentals; create incentives to convert empty living units to housing stock.	Email		x		x	×			×		×		х	x		x	
West Marin Coastal Area	The housing candidate sites for our Marin coastal villages are not suitable as these sites do not have jobs, public transit or community services please consider what doubling the population of these villages would mean to public safety when electricity is out our wells cannot pump water and the many propane tanks result in a hazardous mixture. Our aquifers are undoubtedly low after these droughts it will be a strain on our coastal communities to entertain a larger population many in our village are already renting their small units let's just let SB 9 do its job.	Email		х	х			х		х		х		х	х			

# MARIN COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT: CANDIDATE HOUSING SITES AND SELECTION PROCESS COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

Location	Comment	Source	PCL	INF	SER	TRF	PRK	PTR	АСТ	NMR	SEA	NAT	CUL	FIR	WAT	HLT	EQT	GDL
West Marin Coastal Area	The proposed development and locations designated for housing in unincorporated West Marin is ill-conceived and inappropriate. This appears to be a numbers game on the part of the County and outside, contracted MIG development agency. The plan lacks consideration for or understanding of natural resources, environmental hazards and the existing community. Communities around Tomales Bay are watershed areas with drainage into the vulnerable bay, creeks and streams, the salt marshes and wildlife habitats. The proposed Cottages building site is an environmental hazard to an already contaminated salt marsh and channel leading to Chicken Ranch Beach, Tomales Bay. As a result of previous inappropriate building and filling in a salt marsh, this has been an ongoing problem for many years. The site near Vladimir's restaurant, across from Dixon Marine, is directly across from Tomales Bay and almost at sea level. This area and the road can flood during a high tide or heavy rain, draining pollution into the bay. Also the proposed building would affect the small downtown of Inverness. West Marin is served by narrow, curving, two lane access roads. For Inverness there is only one road, in or out, a problem during flooding, fires, landslides and general overcrowding on weekends and holidays. These roads frequently need repair when lanes crumble into a creek, hillside or the bay. No freeways please, as was proposed in the 60s. I have lived in Inverness since the 70s. As a single working mother, a teacher, I raised my daughter in Inverness. Over the years I have seen families and friends move away as rentals, cottages and small units were converted to more lucrative Airbnbs and second homes. There are 4 houses around me with 2 units in each. Two are completely uncocupied. Two are rarely used by their absentee owners, leaving each second unit vacant. There are many houses like this in Inverness and far too many BnBs and other short term rentals. An absentee owners, leaving each second unit vacant. There are many houses like this i	Email				x					×	×		×	×			
Woodacre	There is a lot for sale as you enter Woodacre at the intersection of Park and Railroad (and an adjacent lot that is not for sale) that would be ideal for seniors with close access to post office and grocery store and bus stop.	Email															Х	Х