

Community Workshop on the Housing Element

May 6, 2014

Summary of Large Group Debrief

What are your top three takeaways?	What did you discover about placing the homes?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We had an active engaging conversation, but did not get into the takeaways. 	<p><i>N/A – no feedback on this question</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not enough public comment on the pros and cons of any of these sites or the whole issue. How are we assured about Environmental Review and that there will be community involvement, given streamlining options? County should show impact of potential density bonus units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are not going to vote on sites until we get more information. No one should vote on sites until they know what they're doing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly put together process; felt pressure to make choices within confines that we don't necessarily agree with. Would've been more helpful to have other options. This is bad politics and represents old style technology. Many code issues have not been dealt with. Important to identify the impacts of any future development and locate where impacts would be met geographically. Reject the idea that car-free workers would live at potential workforce housing at SMART stations. Resent poverty clusters, having personal experience of being raised in the inner city. Poverty clusters and low income housing surrounded by affluence are not good places to raise a family. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We had an engaged and strong-willed exchange; are used to having a high level impact exchange.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We thought we were going to receive Housing Element education tonight, but the staff's presentation and handouts did not meet that goal. Unhappy that our taxpayer dollars were spent on these two housing videos, money would be better spent on education of public on the Housing Element. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We all listened to each other and had a civil conversation.

What are your top three takeaways?	What did you discover about placing the homes?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much misinformation presented on both sides, felt that the process was not trust-building in County staff and decision-makers. • The Housing Element process countywide needs to be challenged. • It would've been more helpful to ask us for "big picture" housing criteria instead. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some attendees declined to participate, because they felt it was a disingenuous process. • Water and traffic are key issues to be considered. • Building housing near the freeway doesn't alleviate any traffic/environmental issues. • Concerned about state-mandated housing planning at the local level. We will have the opportunity to voice our opinions during the Planning Commission hearings to ensure that our viewpoints are heard. • Learned a lot about the Housing Element and the update process. This process feels like a charade, but it is important to keep showing up and sharing our perspectives. • It is disingenuous to discuss sites that you don't know anything about. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a good conversation, but there were too many facilitators at our table.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should work toward a combined consensus of the local people, cities and County all working together, but excluding the State from the process. • High density is unacceptable as it is currently defined in this County. • We want the Tam Valley sites removed from consideration and real environmental problems addressed not ignored. • No sites were selected because Tam Valley is our home and traffic impacts alone make us not want to place additional housing here. We don't want supervisors taking our input at these workshops and turning it against us. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a lively back and forth discussion with varied perspectives and listened to one another.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We rejected the sites offered and provided a discussion of alternatives instead. • Alternatives are not being provided to us by the County to meet our housing needs such as junior second units and increased minimum wage. • With the exception of three Tam Junction sites, we can't recommend selection of any sites due to lack of knowledge about public services, traffic congestion, water supply, schools, infrastructure, and the environment. • The Tam Junction sites present issues where there is a convergence of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process was excellent and everyone had a lot to contribute. • We could've discussed this in length, beyond the end of the workshop time.

What are your top three takeaways?	What did you discover about placing the homes?
<p>unmitigable constraints, which should not be visited upon future residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic, water, flooding and sea level rise, air toxins from highway pollution, noise pollution, all other health impacts, high seismic risk and liquefaction, hazardous material and presence/possibility of endangered species should all be discussed and considered. • In spite of repeated feedback over several years, we feel that our input and expertise has been ignored by the County as evidenced by the repeated inclusion of Tam Valley’s known constrained sites in the attempted pre-determined outcome of this exercise. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very unhappy with process of this workshop. • We believe this discussion should have begun with letting residents provide the criteria that should be used to evaluate and prioritize housing sites. • We object to having to choose from pre-selected sites with very few choices. • We want to discuss other ways to meet Marin’s housing need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a very nice discussion, but didn’t like process overall. • The number of units shown next to the sites on the map are inaccurate and do not represent the total number of units that could actually be built. • In order to select sites, people need to know how it would impact the environment, public health and safety, infrastructure, public services, and neighborhood character.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We noted that there is so much opposition to affordable housing in Marin that it seems impossible to reach civil discourse about where to place affordable housing. • We need to look at the problems of the “Wincup” development as the poster child example of developers taking over the process from the community. • We need solutions that come from deep green retrofitting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of passionate feelings came out of discussion. • Many felt they did not have enough information. • We have very different emotional perspectives, so it was important to listen to each other’s perspectives. • We tried to place homes on sites, but were very split as a group and felt we didn’t know enough to make informed conscientious decisions about placing homes. • We need hubs around transportation such as in West Marin.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had 8 or 9 significant points to discuss, so we spent our time today discussing the process rather than the content. • We prefer locally created solutions to solve affordable housing issues. • Building codes should be meant to protect us, but are hindering creativity and supply of affordable housing. • We would like to seek emphasis on Section 8 housing incentives for people in the local community to build housing for Section 8, not top-down planning like this exercise. • We do not feel comfortable being pinned against others in community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process was very helpful and we had a rich group of diverse backgrounds. • Aging is a team sport. • We did not place any homes for exercise.