<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</th>
<th># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</th>
<th># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</th>
<th># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent's / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarin Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 650 North San Pedro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal settlement for 43 Market Rate homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</td>
<td># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</td>
<td># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</td>
<td># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent's / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarin Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 650 North San Pedro</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Legal settlement for 43 Market Rate homes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No units were placed.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</th>
<th># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</th>
<th># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</th>
<th># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>too many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent's / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Legal settlement for 43 Market Rate homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarind Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>did not get this far</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 650 North San Pedro</td>
<td></td>
<td>In March 2014, the property was purchased to preserve from development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</td>
<td># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</td>
<td># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</td>
<td># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Live Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent’s / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Legal settlement for 43 Market Rate homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarin Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. 650 North San Pedro</strong></td>
<td>In March 2014, the property was purchased to preserve from development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Inverness Valley Inn</strong></td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions for Group Exercise

Date: 5/10/14  Name: MARK INBODY  Group #: 2

Purpose: The purpose of the exercise is twofold: for community members to share different perspectives about housing in Marin; and to collaborate in identifying locations for at least 185 homes in unincorporated Marin County. Your small group facilitator is present to help guide the process and make sure everyone has a voice.

To Prepare:
- Nominate a Recorder. The Recorder’s job is to take notes and record the group’s discussion and takeaways. Please use the writing pad provided and turn in your group notes at the end of the Workshop.
- Nominate a group member to use the Scenario Card to keep a running tally of the homes that are placed on the map. Please turn in your Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.

To Begin the Exercise:
1. Each group member takes 5 minutes in silence to read the Instructions and study the map. Begin to get an idea of where you might want to place the homes. The Location Fact Sheets are available for reference.
2. Begin a group discussion about where to place the homes. Remember to listen to each group member’s perspective and to make group decisions. The group works together to place at least 185 homes on the map, using the color-coded Post-it notes as follows:
   - **Yellow**: at least 61 in the Market Rate range  (= income above $116,500, 4-person household)
   - **Blue**: at least 37 in the Moderate Income range  (= income up to $116,500, 4-person household)
   - **Green**: at least 87 in the Lower Income range  (= income below $88,600, 4-person household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</th>
<th># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</th>
<th># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</th>
<th># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. Vincent’s / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tamarin Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>650 North San Pedro</td>
<td>In March 2014, the property was purchased to preserve from development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please turn over for debrief info)
Debrief

Once the exercise is complete, take a few minutes to debrief as a group and share your thoughts about the exercise. Questions to consider for discussion:

- What are your top three takeaways from the exercise?
- What was it like listening to everyone’s perspectives?
- What did you discover about placing the homes?

Please turn in your group notes and Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.

Notes:

This exercise improperly assumes we cannot:
- Amend the Housing Element
- Withdraw the County from ABAG
- Decline State Transportation funding in favor of determining a zero-growth policy

The tables appear to be in agreement with this point, i.e. that we must accept a housing allocation.

Why did the County spend money on a sales pitch video? It clearly overstates facts like Kruger Pines, to put a gloss on what affordable housing in.

I am not willing to tell other neighborhoods they must have high-density housing and I do not want them telling Strawberry must have.
Instructions for Group Exercise

Date: ______________________ Name: ___________________________ Group #: __________________________

Purpose: The purpose of the exercise is twofold: for community members to share different perspectives about housing in Marin; and to collaborate in identifying locations for at least 185 homes in unincorporated Marin County. Your small group facilitator is present to help guide the process and make sure everyone has a voice.

To Prepare:

- Nominate a Recorder. The Recorder’s job is to take notes and record the group’s discussion and takeaways. *Please use the writing pad provided and turn in your group notes at the end of the Workshop.*
- Nominate a group member to use the Scenario Card to keep a running tally of the homes that are placed on the map. *Please turn in your Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.*

To Begin the Exercise:

1. Each group member takes 5 minutes in silence to read the instructions and study the map. Begin to get an idea of where you might want to place the homes. The Location Fact Sheets are available for reference.

2. Begin a group discussion about where to place the homes. Remember to listen to each group member’s perspective and to make group decisions. The group works together to place at least 185 homes on the map, using the color-coded Post-it notes as follows:
   - **Yellow:** at least 61 in the Market Rate range ( = income above $116,500, 4-person household)
   - **Blue:** at least 37 in the Moderate Income range ( = income up to $116,500, 4-person household)
   - **Green:** at least 87 in the Lower Income range ( = income below $88,600, 4-person household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</th>
<th># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</th>
<th># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</th>
<th># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent’s / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarind Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 650 North San Pedro</td>
<td>In March 2014, the property was purchased to preserve from development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please turn over for debrief info)
Instructions for Group Exercise

Date: ______________ Name: ____________________________ Group #: __________________

**Purpose:** The purpose of the exercise is twofold: for community members to share different perspectives about housing in Marin; and to collaborate in identifying locations for at least 185 homes in unincorporated Marin County. Your small group facilitator is present to help guide the process and make sure everyone has a voice.

**To Prepare:**
- Nominate a Recorder. The Recorder’s job is to take notes and record the group’s discussion and takeaways.
  *Please use the writing pad provided and turn in your group notes at the end of the Workshop.*
- Nominate a group member to use the Scenario Card to keep a running tally of the homes that are placed on the map. *Please turn in your Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.*

**To Begin the Exercise:**
1. Each group member takes 5 minutes in silence to read the instructions and study the map. Begin to get an idea of where you might want to place the homes. The Location Fact Sheets are available for reference.
2. Begin a group discussion about where to place the homes. Remember to listen to each group member’s perspective and to make group decisions. The group works together to place at least 185 homes on the map, using the color-coded Post-it notes as follows:
   - **Yellow:** at least 61 in the Market Rate range \(=\) income above $116,500, 4-person household
   - **Blue:** at least 37 in the Moderate Income range \(=\) income up to $116,500, 4-person household
   - **Green:** at least 87 in the Lower Income range \(=\) income below $88,600, 4-person household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</th>
<th># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</th>
<th># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</th>
<th># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent’s / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarin Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 650 North San Pedro</td>
<td>In March 2014, the property was purchased to preserve from development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please turn over for debrief info)
Debrief

Once the exercise is complete, take a few minutes to debrief as a group and share your thoughts about the exercise.

Questions to consider for discussion:

- What are your top three takeaways from the exercise?
- What was it like listening to everyone’s perspectives?
- What did you discover about placing the homes?

- Sufficient info

Please turn in your group notes and Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.

Notes:

- Don't want to be unwrapped
- Unable to describe
- Exercise
- Can't define house
- Trust process; lots of distrust
- Illusion of local control
Instructions for Group Exercise

Date: 5/10/14  Name: Ann  Group #: 2

Purpose: The purpose of the exercise is twofold: for community members to share different perspectives about housing in Marin; and to collaborate in identifying locations for at least 185 homes in unincorporated Marin County. Your small group facilitator is present to help guide the process and make sure everyone has a voice.

To Prepare:
- Nominate a Recorder. The Recorder’s job is to take notes and record the group’s discussion and takeaways. Please use the writing pad provided and turn in your group notes at the end of the Workshop.
- Nominate a group member to use the Scenario Card to keep a running tally of the homes that are placed on the map. Please turn in your Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.

To Begin the Exercise:
1. Each group member takes 5 minutes in silence to read the Instructions and study the map. Begin to get an idea of where you might want to place the homes. The Location Fact Sheets are available for reference.
2. Begin a group discussion about where to place the homes. Remember to listen to each group member’s perspective and to make group decisions. The group works together to place at least 185 homes on the map, using the color-coded Post-it notes as follows:
   - Yellow: at least 61 in the Market Rate range (= income above $116,500, 4-person household)
   - Blue: at least 37 in the Moderate Income range (= income up to $116,500, 4-person household)
   - Green: at least 87 in the Lower Income range (= income below $88,600, 4-person household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of homes from prior Housing Element</th>
<th># Market Rate Homes (61 minimum)</th>
<th># Moderate Income Homes (37 minimum)</th>
<th># Lower Income Homes (87 minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marinwood Plaza</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oak Manor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Old Chevron Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. St. Vincent’s / Silveira</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Easton Point</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal settlement for 43 Market Rate homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tamarin Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manzanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grandi Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 650 North San Pedro</td>
<td>In March 2014, the property was purchased to preserve from development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Golden Gate Seminary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Marin City CDC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Armstrong Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inverness Valley Inn</td>
<td>Location is not included in final Site Inventory for the certified Housing Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Grady Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please turn over for debrief info)
Debrief

Once the exercise is complete, take a few minutes to debrief as a group and share your thoughts about the exercise. Questions to consider for discussion:

- What are your top three takeaways from the exercise?
- What was it like listening to everyone’s perspectives?
- What did you discover about placing the homes?

Please turn in your group notes and Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.

Notes:
1. This exercise puts the cart before the horse in that we don't agree with 185 units and don't have information about all these sites.
   - Want to know: impact of water, traffic, schools;
   - What immediate residents want to happen to the property.
2. Why were some of these sites picked? Many have toxins, flood issues, etc.
3. Video made it seem like everyone has a right to live in Marin, even if you can't afford it. We question the 185 unit requirement.

2. We were a hardworking group, really tried to do our job, listened carefully to each other.
3. Insufficient info. to place homes
Debrief

Once the exercise is complete, take a few minutes to debrief as a group and share your thoughts about the exercise.

Questions to consider for discussion:

- What are your top three takeaways from the exercise?
- What was it like listening to everyone’s perspectives?
- What did you discover about placing the homes?

*Please turn in your group notes and Scenario Card at the end of the Workshop.*

Notes:

Hidden costs to Marin taxpayers when people with special needs move out of the county.

County planners should develop & show alternative plans so we can choose other approaches to meeting housing needs.

We should know the cost of a project before it's approved, including social services.

Each community knows its own area best so focus on local concerns. Citizens make decisions about sites where we don't live.

Not presented with impacts of development (social & financial price) such as schools, traffic, sea level rise, seismic conditions etc.

We have 20% with affordable housing. He not like we are not doing anything.

Numbers on handout regarding sites do not identify potential buildout based on possible state density bonuses & environmental streamlining.

No development of Tom Valley constrained sites.
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/14 Name (optional): Ann Spence

1. How did you hear about this workshop? email

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop? Information about Strawbery and special needs residents

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element? Develop alternative approaches to meet community needs

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/12/2014  Name (optional): DEAN WEISS

1. How did you hear about this workshop?  County Employee

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?  Improved knowledge of County Housing goals

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?  It's necessary

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/2014  Name (optional): ____________________________

1. How did you hear about this workshop?  E-MAIL

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
WE NEED MORE INFORMATION.

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
WE NEED ALTERNATIVE PLANS AND AN ANALYSIS OF EACH ALTERNATIVE'S COSTS.

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
   + NOTICE OF MEETINGS
   + STAFF REPORTS
   + ALL CORRESPONDENCE FROM INTEREST PARTIES

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Additional Comments:

DIDN'T SEE THE NEED FOR PAYING FOR A CONSULTANT TO RUN THE MEETING.

PLANNING STAFF COULD HAVE DONE THE JOB ON ITS OWN.

Thank you so much for your feedback!
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: May 10, 2014  Name (optional): Basia Crane

1. How did you hear about this workshop?
   From Joan Bennett

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
   How complex housing for workforce is and how uninformed voters could vote in SB 375 and SB 743 to create this.

3. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
   It's not near transit (SMART) corridor

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10
Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop? KAR SEARS

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
   THAT THERE IS A CLEAR MESSAGE TO THE COUNTY THAT THE
   DEVELOPMENT PROFITING DENSITY APPROACH IS NOT ACCEPTABLE
   TO RESIDENTS (AND NOT THE ONLY WAY TO GET AFFORDABLE HOUSING)

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
   IDSAFETY IDEAS DENSITY DEVELOPMENT AREAS AND COMMUNITIES
   WILL NOT OBJECT.

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
   BROWN/LEE SHOUL DO A ROAD SHOW
   AND EXPLAIN WHY WE'RE TAKING THE APPROACH WE ARE.

---

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback

Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: May 10/14
Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop? e-mail

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop? Good info came from participants - not be tied to high density - Community needs info on various laws and their impact on development - SB375, SB743, SB1

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element? 

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

---

**Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement.** (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Additional Comments:

Developments should be well planned, and not tied to high density. In fact, second units could be very helpful.

Thank you so much for your feedback!
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/14 Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop? Newspaper

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
   Want local control

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

---

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: _5.10.2014_ Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop? _Online_

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

---

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/2014 Name (optional): Stephen Mars

1. How did you hear about this workshop?
   Marin If

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
   How the public is being manipulated with false choices and insufficient data.

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
   The majority of the residents have serious process problems with basic assumptions from all points of view.

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Facilitators were nice people.
Community Workshop: Housing Element

**Participant Feedback**
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10
Name (optional): Kay Harris

1. How did you hear about this workshop? EMAIL

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?

   MAKE WORK NEEDED - EACH COMMUNITY WOULD
   NEED TO BE DISCUSS DEVELOPMENT OF OWN AREA

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued on back*
Community Workshop: Housing Element

**Participant Feedback**
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: [Signature]  Name (optional): [Signature]

1. **How did you hear about this workshop?**  **ON LINE**

2. **What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?**
   
   **GOT A LIST OF SITES**

3. **What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?**
   
   **MORE COMMENT**

4. **What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)**
   
   **DETAILED COMMENT**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued on back*
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/2014  
Name (optional): Catherine Dunlap

1. How did you hear about this workshop?  
   I see next door

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?  
   Unfair planning process. Each community should do its own planning.

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?  
   The State should have no say over Marin Planning. Local Control should be in place.

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
   Throw out the list.  
   Start over with each community’s input.  
   Film was slanted to affordable housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops

Date: 5-6-14
Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop?

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?

3. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back

3501 Civic Center Drive · Suite 308 · San Rafael, CA 94903-4157 · 415 473 6269 T · 415 473 7880 F · 415 473 2255 TTY · www.marincounty.org/plan
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/14 Name (optional): MARK MUBODY

1. How did you hear about this workshop?
   Email from Supervisor Aanes

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
   The county assumes that its residents want to participate in top-down planning "requirements."

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
   Start over. Get out of ABAS.

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
   None.

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither agree nor disagree Agree Strongly Agree

1. The information was presented in a clear way. □ □ □ □ □

2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants. □ □ □ □ □

3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved. □ □ □ □ □

4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful. □ □ □ □ □

5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable. □ □ □ □ □

Continued on back
Thank you Jason for volunteering.

Thank you so much for your feedback!
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/14       Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop?  THRU 1 J — THANK YOU

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?

   NEED FOR MORE CONVERSATION
   + TRANSPARENCY

3. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?

   ESTABLISH A COUNTY AD HOC COMMUNITY HOUSING GROUP
   TO ENGAGE RESIDENTS OF SITES

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

   GREAT FACILITATORS!
   THANKS!

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/14
Name (optional): ____________________________

1. How did you hear about this workshop?
   Website

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
   We need more information before we make any decisions on any new housing needs in the county.

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
   A full & complete explanation of the various Senate bills & their impact on local control & local zoning laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back
Additional Comments:

Jason Satterfield
Good facilitator

Thank you so much for your feedback!
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5-10-14  Name (optional):

1. How did you hear about this workshop? better than Plan Bay Area’s

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop? Necessary information was left out

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element? The 30 units/0 default density needs to be prominent in the introduction.

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
I would need to watch all of the BOS meetings, Planning Commission meetings & other housing meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on back

*Our facilitator Jean Reynolds was a peach!*
Community Workshop: Housing Element

**Participant Feedback**
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10/1A  Name (optional): MARA BLACKER

1. **How did you hear about this workshop?**
   - Supervisor Sears' email newsletter

2. **What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?**
   - This entire process is putting the cart before the horse.
   - Don't ask us to analyze sites about traffic/educational/impact/environmental analyses.
   - We have no business making these decisions about this information.
   - Nor should our city planners.

3. **What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element?** (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)
   - Emails or further meetings, etc.

---

**Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement.** (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers' seat was valuable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Continued on back*
Community Workshop: Housing Element

**Participant Feedback**

Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 6/10/14  
Name (optional):

1. **How did you hear about this workshop?** County website

2. **What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?**
   
   This is a very difficult process. We didn't know enough about the sites to make decisions.

2. **What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?**
   
   I think the county should withdraw from ABAG.

3. **What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element?** (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

---

**Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement.** (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued on back*
Additional Comments:

Jason Satterfield, Facilitator
Did a great job.

Thank you so much for your feedback!
Community Workshop: Housing Element

Participant Feedback
Your feedback will help us prepare for future workshops.

Date: 5/10 __________________________ Name (optional): Dave County

1. How did you hear about this workshop? EMAIL

2. What is the most valuable thing you are taking away from this workshop?
   THAT A LOT OF EDUCATION IS NEEDED ABOUT FEASIBILITY, FAIR HOUSING, AND NEED

2. What other input would you like to give us about the Housing Element?
   PLEASE RE-DO THE WORKSHOP IN MARIN COUNTY

3. What more information do you need to stay current with the Housing Element? (Please provide your contact information if you would like staff to follow-up with you)

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement. (Check one box for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information was presented in a clear way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I shared perspectives and ideas with other participants.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My understanding of the Housing Element and the update process has improved.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and other meeting materials were informative and helpful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sitting in the decision-makers’ seat was valuable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nov: same sit, choosing sites = challenging
Com Ad-hoc group - rep members reg, long process -> consensus + sites
How have they say in other comm's?
Also not fair. Conc about JA said
No sites in I.V.
For every area.

How were sites selected?
A: from community.
Leece: In housing element just passed
Did straw pick their sites?
Leece: County did it w/ task force
Which task force? Gov't agency?
Wants clarification of these sites in strawberry.

Kentfield Advisory Mtg member - need new S.A.D. are new good sites, forced to make selection
Best of possible suggestions
Task force did a survey

Sop did not tell about I.V. sites.

IV she is fam, but entire Nov/ task force
wasn't involved because JA said not included
so feels can't comment = surprise
Jim wants to discuss Straw
Wincup - is it related
Asking if we/county doesn't know why

Catherine: described housing info, sale
to a trust, in negotiation. Doesn't feel
appropriate to discuss.

Kevin: What about Mannwood Plaza - long
time in the news. Feels should be on
the list to receive sites.

must chemical/toxic pollution

How about Marin City? Did they select it?
Who chose?

Leelee

Catherine thinks good site.

- terrified of gentrification

Catherine: P&L, age use, need housing. Third
good place to add. 2 not enough.

Jim concerned w/ PC + BOS doing anything with today's info.
Where does Transit Oriented Development come from?
Why do we have?
What do you mean by statewide strategy?
Is this a PDA?
Is this going to affect

Trish: Not comfortable.

Catherine begins with seminary.
Kevin: Marinwood can receive capacity.

Jim: Susan Adams interested in hearing from MW.
What right do we have to comment on their community.
Do people in MV have any control over the development?
Who picked housing element task force?

Catherine: Why matter who?

What are the unincorporated islands?

Catifo Park: Industrial area. Good spot for apt or too close to fwy.

Jim: How much is county paying powers to do this public workshop?
Describing CAL PARK site

Debrief

- Development along freeway prevents residents to enjoy air quality

- Frustration with process
  - Inability of community members to comment on their community they know they lived
  - Prevents e.g. individuals from commenting
    - Not county wide
    - e.g. individuals
      - Transparency
        - Many ??
  - Difficulty/impossible to comment on others

Kevin: Task force started with large amount of parcels this is narrowed down

Jim: Where did strawberry come from?

Jim: Transparency funding - where come strawberry was a PDA from?
    - Does this have anything to do w/ MTC?
    - So SK + KR + KS

"Regional Planning"
Don't know enough
Incentivize OP
Group #8 3 members
Recorder "Tablee"

Jeara Reynolds - Facilitator/not expert.
Probation Dept City.

"Tablee" still singular.

What the feelings & questions of the community are is the goal.
Remove from list

#7 Not approved for high density 3 2A lots minimum, for market rate only - no affordable housing overlay applies 2A per unit minimum also too remote Access to historic Baylands

Remove from list Canadian flyway, too destructive to wildlife

#4 Old Chevron Station - traffic congestion, flood hazard, historic wetlands
Remove from list

#9 Manzanita - traffic congestion, flood hazard, water ponding, historic wetlands

#14 Armstrong Nursery - flood hazard, historic wetlands, 1st responder wants high density, Recorder doesn't
Site #16 Too remote should be greenbelt. Site #1 should remain commercial. (Also visual impact)
People can walk to 101 (green buffer/green zone)
Site #5 Both respondents say leave agricultural
Site #8 Both respondents say leave agricultural professional

3rd Takeaway
A 3rd party, planning consultant insures impartiality (We don't have that) + insures that all individuals are heard + represented and noticed about all meetings + draft proposals are distributed county wide to prevent small groups or nonprofits from co-opting the process (a tail that wags the dog)

Only 8 of 17 sites were discussed
No other sites were discussed

Debrief questions:
What are top 3 takeaways
1. Citizen participation is valuable if some identification is done for residents
1st respondent wants owner + tenant I.D.
2. We are not competent to comment on most of these areas + we did not comment at all on ones of which we have no knowledge
1. AGREE THAT WE DON'T KNOW ENOUGH TO DECIDE - 155,000 8 YR
   2. LET'S SEPARATE DESIRED FROM AFFORDABILITY ON ANY - 29/7IA?
      IF WE'RE GOING TO INCENTIVIZE, LET'S INCENTIVIZE
      ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES NOT DIVIDENDS

3. REFORM LEGISLATION AND 375/743
   LACK OF CLARITY MARGINAL STRATEGY

OUR PERSPECTIVES WERE PRETTY SIMILAR
# Table 2

1. **Marin Wood**: 0  
   - We are concerned about toxins in this property.  
   - Also, very close to highway - poor quality of life

2. **Oak Manor**:  
   - Currently needs to be updated, is ugly.  
   - What do the local residents want to happen?

3. **California Park**:  
   - Next to train tracks, not healthy.  
   - SO is too many units.

4. **Old Chevron Site**:  
   - Contaminated soil.  
   - Flood area.  
   - 10 is too many units

5. **St. Vincent / Silveira**: 0  
   - Toxins from site1 flow to this area.  
   - Agricultural area needs to be preserved.  
   - 221 is too many

6. **Easton Point**: 43  
   - 43 houses already approved  
   - We approve these 43 court stipulated homes provided that it undergoes rigid environmental review.
7. Tamarin Lane
   We don't have enough information about this site.
   We like trees.

8. Indian Valley
Luke: The exercise makes no sense. The Tam Valley `Almost sites are all unsuitable and I don't know enough about the other sites. We shouldn't do the exercise.

Dave: Let's do the exercise.

Kay: I'm in real estate and I don't feel qualified to discuss sites outside my neighborhood. High-density housing along the freeway is unhealthy.

Dave: Largest subsidies are mortgage interest deduction and Proposition 13, which subsidizes single-family homes.

Kay: Should not use eminent domain to replace freeway frontage road businesses with housing. Ok if affordable housing is set back from the freeway.

Dave: If zoning changes, land costs might go down.

Kay: Not sure of that.

Kay: There are too many rentals already in Strawberry. We need a broad range of housing choices.

Likes Ned's Way.

Agreed—We should preserve the ridges.

Dave: Countywide plan from 1973 calls for higher densities along 101.

Kay: But the Strawberry Community Plan doesn't. Strawberry residents should suggest sites for second
units and stacked units.


Dave - From 1995 to 2003, Marin population grew by 15%, but traffic increased by a much higher 24. Affordable housing generates fewer trips per unit than market rate housing.

Luke - Prefers reusing existing buildings rather than new construction along train route.

Supports second units without the poison pill of fees & hookup fees to legalize second units.


Kay - Many who commute to Marin prefer a longer commute so they can afford a house with a yard. We need housing, we need to find a way to do it realistically.

Agreement: Preserve agricultural areas, ridge lines, and wetlands.

Dave - Cities and unincorporated areas near cities should join to provide affordable housing.

Agreement: Hsg element is not just about low income units.

Dave - Tam Valley unfairly opposes affordable housing. 

Luke - Issue in Tam Valley is flood zone and traffic. The sites aren't suitable. Density bonuses and CEQA streamlining can result in much higher density than stated in the hsg element.

Kay - County should hold community meetings, one meeting in each community.
TAKE AWAYS

There was agreement that we should preserve agricultural areas, ridgelines, and wetlands.
There wasn't agreement about these positions that some folks around the table felt strongly about:
- Tam Valley-Almonte sites are unsuitable due to flood zone and traffic.
- Sites immediately adjacent have an air quality problem.
- We may tend to exaggerate traffic and financial impacts of subsidized vs. market-rate homes.

LISTENING TO OTHERS

Better than expected, given the diversity of opinions around the table, we could have a conversation about issues on which we disagree.

PLACING THE HOMES

We don't want to be confined by the exercise.
We're reluctant to plan for neighborhoods other than where we live.
The categories the planners provide
and the categories provided for the exercise may not be the most suitable. Should expand the process to consider second units and sites at least a few blocks from the freeway (due to air quality).
Comment

"I don't know anything about these sites. I don't feel that we should be using sites we don't know about."

— Lil Bean

Mrs. Realtoon

I am opposed to high density housing. Not the freezing. It's just not healthy.

I disagree with the exercise. Luke

It would have been much more effective if we can't.

We need housing, we need to do it in a reasonable way.

Yet protect our environment. In search of death & CEPA.

I'm supportive of affordable housing. Yes, we do need affordable housing. This is not about

"It's where they can go to me."
"I don't know why about the def."
I don't feel that we should be very on soils.
We don't know about.

I am opposed to high density housing.
Table 10

For us to sit and say, "Put some heroes in first flood zone, so that makes sense."
Strawberry Housing Workshop:

Vic: "We are not going to become San Francisco, if we can prevent it.

Linda: "Infrastructure, water, sewer, quality of life.

Karen: How about West Marin. Is the Sacamini family behind this keeping it out of the equation.

Steve: Not enough info to make decisions. Begs the questions, what is this really about. Nont-Profits pay little taxes and are therefore subsidize.

Facilitators:

Amy Brown: Federal Grants
D'Angello: Income Assistance
What's with the "Quilt Tripping" movie.

LINDA: Seniors happy with smaller units, but not good for families. Mini buses for seniors, more time to organize and do group outings. Remember our Community Plans.

STEVE: This is "here's the solution, set with it." Rotary Village (10 units) does not recognize the effort middle-class people make to establish themselves in the community. Their sacrifices are not honored here.

CLAYTON: Tam Valley Sites? Traffic, popup.

LINDA: What do we do with the people on the lower end?
1) Process set to confuse and deceive. "A joke."
2) Allocations are just a developer's smoke screen to build more high-density market rate housing.
3) Information inaccurate and deficient.
4) Better way: 10-12 units
5) Why are we limited to these sites?
6) Purposely so scammable to make useful decisions on.
7) Income alone cannot be sufficient.
8) Numbers and the science don't mix truthfully.
9) Too much regulatory expense to effectively do fulfilling development.
1. Indian Valley 0 Low Income
   - No buses

2. No sidewalks
   - No grocery within several miles
   - Services from Sheriff

3. Barry and Esther are so frustrated and leaving.

4. Tamarind Lane 0 Low
   - No transportation
   - No sidewalks

5. Grady Ranch
   - Bus service was extended could be
   - Water

   Lack of knowledge water supply is a troubling in a decision on site

6. Marinwood
   - Live/Work

40
Solar or other greenhouse should be included in this.

St. Vincent's — Nothing

6. Easton Point
   - No transportation
   - Difficult to build steep

1. Gold Gate Seminary — 0
   - Nothing but shark bite

Most all locations are unable to handle low income.

For valuable to here an Indian perspective, job is difficult.

These numbers are handed out by ABWC and I feel the local people should have control.
After viewing the film, we question where the members were based. Please add footnote on film.

We were not happy with Kate Powers speaking over people. Very annoying.
Tiburon 5/10

Concerns for special needs families have to go to other countries to get care but taxes from Marin are still increasing to take care of them - Ed, disabled housing advocate. "Hidden tax on home owners" tax implication in redistributing personal special needs to other counties. Property tax gets sent to the state that doesn't get recycled into Marin.

High density - some areas have many, some have more renters than homeowners = not enough revenue to offer the rentable as they aren't paying taxes.

Fire-side cost 500k to build, permit which taxpayer subsidized, it was unfair to people/ special needs, vulnerable people in the most vulnerable areas of the county. The choices of location are unreasonabile. 20% of the kids in the county are autistic. There is not a plan to address the services they need.

There's not state or federal

If I were a planner, I would develop alternative strategies some of the sites named are contaminated and considered fully unsound.
Tam Valley area should not be developed. We approve projects upon understanding the cost. Each community should talk onsite areas they know. Do people with special needs have access to services?

The #3 on the exercise sheet identifies the sites that request the potential build out be a developer could apply for a site density bonus or streamlining of reviews. Review.
TABLE 1

REORDER AS OUGAN

SUMMARY

1. INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION PROVIDED TO MAKE ANY TYPE OF MEASURED AND THOUGHTFUL DECISIONS.

2. INFO THAT WAS PROVIDED WAS NOT CLEAR, CASE IN POINT SITE B. WHICH IS NOT A PLANNED MAP. INFO STATES ZONE FOR 5 UNITS. NOT CLEAR IF THIS WILL BE REZONED FOR HIGHER DENSITY AS SITE IS 7.7 ACRES.

3. IT IS NOT CLEAR IF THE # OF UNITS ON INFO SHOET WILL REMAIN SAME IF SITE IS PURCHASED.
The Strawberry neighborhood has many new, young families but also has a large population of seniors. As a member of the Strawberry Rec Board, I have the opportunity to speak to many of the Strawberry residents. It has become clear to me that there is a large population of seniors/widows who raised their families and now would like to sell their homes and stay in Strawberry in a senior housing situation. Having this incorporated in the Seminary re-development would be a smart move.

Thank You!
FEASIBILITY

- Amount or $ funding reported
  - Purchased today better price
  - Lower hours - in full values

GROWTH OF JOBS

20% in the future

NUMBER OF JOBS / in 2015
5,000 Commercial Area
1,000 Commercial (vacant)

Implementation of procedure at cost A.E.

UP 20 527
10 90
Low tech

90% of the
Community

70% of the population in the future

Specify for "office complex"
Each Marin County Housing Element includes an Available Land Inventory that consists of enough Affordable Housing Opportunity Sites to meet the projected housing needs of Unincorporated Marin for the housing element's planning period. Three Tam Junction sites are included in the current 2012 Marin County Housing Element (2007 to 2014) and two Tam Junction sites are proposed for inclusion in the next Housing Element (2014 to 2022).

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2012 Housing Element evaluated the possible development of 182 residential units at these five Tam Junction sites, which are listed below:

**CURRENT HOUSING ELEMENT PLANNING CYCLE (2007 to 2014)**
- Site #4: Old Chevron Station, 204 Flamingo Rd, (.79 acres) (21 units)
- Site #9: Manzanita Mixed Use, 150 Shoreline Hwy, (.58 acres) (3 units)
- Site #14: Armstrong Nursery, 217/221 Shoreline Hwy, (1.77 acres) (53 units)

**NEXT HOUSING ELEMENT PLANNING CYCLE (2014 to 2022)**
- Site #18: Around Manzanita (150 Shoreline Hwy), (1.48 acres) (45 units)
- Site #19: Tam Junction Retail, 237 Shoreline Hwy, etc., (6.8 acres) (60 units)

Sites included in the Available Land Inventory are targeted for potential high-density housing with a density of up to 30 units per acre (or up to 40 units per acre if the State Density Bonus is granted).

According to the Countywide Plan, our commercial mixed-use areas are supposed to have a CAP of no more than 100 new residential units, which is already too many. So, it is curious as to why the Housing Elements' EIR evaluated 182 units.

**Compare the numbers above with the numbers on your map**

*Note: State + County Law could allow a density bonus up to 35% over these numbers. For reference, the Fireside high density housing development got 45 units an acre.*
Marin County Housing Element Workshop:
A Flawed Exercise

1. Expensive outside consultant chairs “Workshop”; County facilitators direct outcome.

2. Misleading film & presentation:
   - Presentation talks about the need for affordable housing.
     Not emphasized: Housing Element sites could be developed with mostly unaffordable market-rate housing.
   - Presentation talks about preserving the environment.
     Not mentioned: The Baylands Corridor, the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt and other environmentally sensitive areas have been opened up to potential high density housing development.
   - Misleading claims are made that proposed development would receive full review.
     Not mentioned: State laws could streamline or exempt environmental review and reduce protections.
   - Questions are briefly allowed but no comments, thereby limiting available information.

3. Site selection workshop based on insufficient site information:
   - Presumption of community agreement to urbanize Marin near transit.
     No information about the fact that residents living near freeways and busy roads are exposed to high levels of air pollution, and therefore are at greater risk of developing serious illnesses, including cardiovascular disease, asthma, cancer, miscarriage and autism.
   - Inaccurate description of the potential number of units that could be developed on specific sites (E.g. 10 units at one site that was evaluated by the SEIR for 53 units!)
   - No information about the State Density Bonus Law that supersedes County regulations and allows for greater densities and exceptions to height limits, setbacks and parking requirements.
   - No information about how development at the sites would impact the environment, traffic, public services (such as schools), public infrastructure, water supply or health and safety, etc.
   - No information about alternative approaches to meeting the housing needs of lower income households rather than new development on preselected sites. (E.g.: conversion of existing units, second units, rent vouchers, a living wage, low interest loans, etc.)

4. Most attendees tend to be:
   ... unfamiliar with sites not in their area,
   ... have only limited or misleading information to base any selection upon; and
   ... are not allowed to consider other options.
   Therefore, they should not be urged into small groups to make specific selections.

5. The “Workshop” process creates the illusion of an informed public working in an open and inclusive way to find appropriate solutions but instead carefully frames a limited set of choices and drives participants to a pre-determined outcome.

OPPOSE THE FLAWED SITE SELECTION PROCESS!
- Share your knowledge about the hazards and environmental constraints of sites;
- Refuse to be pushed into selecting sites you don't know for a flawed strategy;
- Encourage others to do the same.
Marin County Housing Element Workshop: Questions that Need Answering

- Why does the promotional video prominently feature a well-known and vocal advocate for new high-density housing developments?
- Why did the County feel it necessary to hire a high-priced consultant?
- Why are we only allowed to ask questions briefly, rushed on to the “exercise”, and not allowed to make any comments?
- Why, while they are talking about environmental protection, aren’t we being told that a Countywide Plan amendment opened up environmentally sensitive areas to more high-density housing development?
- Why are we not allowed in this exercise to make choices other than the sites they selected?
- Why aren’t we being told the total potential number of units that could be built at the sites, which in some cases is many times more than the number given?
- Why aren’t we being told that, due to density bonuses, housing developments could be built at densities that greatly exceed the densities being advertised?
- Why are we being told that proposed development would receive full review, while State laws allow for potential streamlining or exemption of environmental review and could reduce protections?
- Why can’t we talk about other solutions to fulfilling the County’s housing need like second units, conversions, rent vouchers, a living wage, and low interest housing loans?
- What about solutions that don’t segregate, isolate, and create islands of housing?
- Why is new “Transit Oriented Development” being promoted even though it does not meaningfully reduce traffic or increase public transportation ridership? Due to Marin’s inconvenient and insufficient public transportation, and the need to carry children, equipment, or large purchases, the vast majority of Marin residents rely on their personal vehicles to travel within Marin.
- Why aren’t we being told that residents living near busy roads and freeways are exposed to high levels of toxic air contaminants and thus are at greater risk of developing chronic and life-threatening illnesses, such as cardiovascular disease, asthma, cancer, miscarriage and autism?
- Why aren’t we being told how development at the sites would impact public health and safety, infrastructure, public services (E.g. schools), the environment, traffic congestion, water supply and the traditional character of neighborhoods, etc.?
DO YOU KNOW WHAT’S AT STAKE WITH PROPOSED NEW DEVELOPMENT IN LARKSPUR?

If unchecked, we could see FIVE TIMES the Wincup Development at Larkspur Landing!

The City of Larkspur has developed a ‘preferred plan’ for the Larkspur Landing area that would allow the building of 920 residential units and more than 200,000 additional square feet of retail, office and hotel space. Our tax dollars paid for an “Environmental Impact Report” that states that this level of development “would not significantly exacerbate existing...(traffic) congestion in the Station Area.”

There is a 60 day public comment period on this report. That report and other ‘Station Area Plan’ (SAP) documents can be found at www.CityofLarkspur.org

We ask every Marin citizen to voice their opinion on this push toward development that will clog our roads, increase greenhouse gases, and add more stress on our schools, roads, police, fire, water supply and sewer systems.

Add your email at www.LarkspurFightsBack.com to receive information on City Council meetings and events associated with fighting these expensive and misguided boondoggles.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. Email the Planning Department at lk_planning@cityoflarkspur.org Subject: Comment on the EIR
2. Send emails to the Larkspur City Council. No changes to our existing zoning, no allowing high density in the General Plan
   Ann Morrison amorison@cityoflarkspur.org
   Larry Chu lchu@cityoflarkspur.org
   Kevin Haroff kharoff@cityoflarkspur.org
   Dan Hilmer dhilmer@cityoflarkspur.org
   Catherine Way cway@cityoflarkspur.org
3. Send emails to Supervisor Steven Kinsey, who represents Larkspur on the Marin County Board of Supervisors. SKinsey@marincounty.org
4. Ask Assemblyman Marc Levine to get Sacramento OUT of our planning process
   assemblymember.levine@assembly.ca.gov

MARK YOUR CALENDARS... COMING SOON:

Screening of “Rebels With a Cause,” a stunningly beautiful film about the schemers and dreamers who fought to keep developers from taking over the breathtaking landscape of Point Reyes National Seashore and GGNRA.

Discussion with filmmakers following film!

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 7PM, LARK THEATER

549 Magnolia Ave., Larkspur
Tickets available ONLY at the door. Doors open at 6:30pm
$20 donation suggested to LarkspurFightsBack.com

For more information: LarkspurFightsBack.com
**contract Accounting**

**Vendor Code:** 1013306

**Name:** Powers Consulting

**For:** Housing Element 2

**Dates:** 8/3/2014 - 6/3/2014

**Grant:** N/R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund No.</th>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>Purchase Order No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Increased/Decreased</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Contract Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>60000022160</td>
<td>0210110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purchase Order:**

1. **450005351**
   - **Invoice:**
     - 450005351
     - **Date:** 8/3/2014
     - **Reference:** Proc Req
     - **Expenditures:** 5,000.00
     - **Balance:** 5,000.00

2. **450005351**
   - **Invoice:**
     - 450005351
     - **Date:** 8/3/2014
     - **Reference:** Proc Req
     - **Expenditures:** 3,012.50
     - **Balance:** 2,087.50

3. **56001014165**
   - **Invoice:**
     - 56001014165
     - **Date:** 8/3/2014
     - **Reference:** Proc Req
     - **Expenditures:** 4,012.50
     - **Balance:** 125.00

**Addendum: 1st Addendum**

- **Vendor Code:** 1013306
- **Purchase Order No.:** 450005351
- **PO:**
  - **Date:** 8/3/2014
  - **Reference:** Proc Req
  - **Expenditures:** 23,000.00
  - **Balance:** 23,250.00

- **Vendor Code:** 50001100352
  - **Invoice:**
    - 50001100352
    - **Date:** 8/3/2014
    - **Reference:** Proc Req
    - **Expenditures:** 16,112.50
    - **Balance:** 17,012.50

- **Vendor Code:** 5600103360
  - **Invoice:**
    - 5600103360
    - **Date:** 8/3/2014
    - **Reference:** Proc Req
    - **Expenditures:** 5,012.50
    - **Balance:** 12,000.00
# Environmental Constraints & Hazards at the Tam Junction Housing Opportunity Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>Site #4 Chevron</th>
<th>Site #9 Manzanita</th>
<th>Site #14 Armstrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion (LOS “F”)</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding, 100 Year Floodplain</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Rise</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Seismic Activity with High Liquefaction, Subsidence, &amp; Mud Displacement</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Air &amp; Noise Pollution from Hwy 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Air &amp; Noise Pollution from Hwy 1</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Contaminated Groundwater, Soil &amp; Vapors from Hazardous Materials at Gas Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Endangered Species</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic on Hwy 1

Flooding in Manzanita
Dear Marin County Residents,

MCA Lawsuit is our best chance to make the Marin County accountable to its residents and reverse densification. We need your help to win! Several generous donors have agreed to match your donations up to $12,000.

This match will fully fund the lawsuit!

Your $25 will become $50 Donation!

Please Donate Now.

To Donate and Learn More about the Marin Community Alliance Lawsuit, Q&A and Information Flyer Available at:

www.alliancemarin.org.

Thank you for your support!

Marin Community Alliance Team