Planning Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA
April 21, 2016 – 9:30 a.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Administrative
   3.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
   3.2. Review Meeting Notes from March 17, 2016* – ACTION
4. Round table members discussion
5. Toolbox for Ending Homelessness* –presentation by Jim Leddy, Sonoma County Community Development
7. SCTA & MTC Planning
   7.1. Moving Forward 2040 – SCTAs Comprehensive Transportation Plan update
   7.2. Plan Bay Area-This agenda: https://mtc.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=450411&GUID=FDB97AC0-58BA-476C-BF39-429A01DEB061&Options=info&Search= has a good collection of staff reports on the current status of Plan Bay Area.
8. Other Business /Next agenda
9. Adjourn

*Attachment

The next S C T A meeting will be held May 9, 2016
The next P A C meeting will be held May 19, 2016

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA/RCPA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.
SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Transit-Technical Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.

TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check www.511.org, www.srcity.org/citybus, www.sctransit.com or https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Meeting Notes of March 17, 2016

ITEM

1. Introductions
   Meeting called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Janet Spilman.

   Committee Members: Scott Duiven, City of Petaluma; Jon-Paul Harries, City of Cotati; Kim Jordan, Town of Windsor; Gillian Hayes, Graton Rancheria; Amy Lyle, Sonoma County PRMD; Kenyon Webster, City of Sebastopol.

   Staff: Brant Arthur, Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio, Janet Spilman, Dana Turréy.

2. Public Comment
   N/A

3. Administrative
   3.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
   Ms. Spilman suggested scheduling meetings on a bimonthly rather than monthly starting in May. The Committee consensus was to change the meeting schedule accordingly.

   Ms. Spilman announced that next month’s agenda would include community separators.

   3.2. Review Meeting Notes from February 18, 2016* – ACTION
   Approved as submitted.

4. Round table members discussion
   City of Petaluma:

   Scott Duiven reported on significant recent development activity. This includes development between the SMART rail station and the Petaluma River and a large industrial project (24,000 sq. ft.).

   Town of Windsor:

   Kim Jordan reported that the General Plan Update is ongoing. She also noted recent interest in the medical marijuana issue.

   In response to Committee questions, Ms. Jordan explained that Windsor has a growth control policy. Projects are approved through a merit process.

   Graton Rancheria:

   Gillian Hayes reported that the Rancheria is recruiting for an Environmental Coordinator. Additional recent activities include work on a tribal wetlands plan; receipt of a County well permit; the finalization of a Tribal Community Garden Plan; the award of a climate protection grant through a partnership with RCPA and other agencies for two climate workshops; a Tribal Renewable Energy Plan; a ribbon cutting for seven electric vehicle chargers; a feasibility study for a hotel rooftop structure, the hotel roof, parking lot, and convention center. The casino hotel is scheduled to open in November 2016.

   Ms. Hayes next reported that the tribal government is growing and staff is examining other office properties for relocation. The Transportation Plan is moving forward and is expected to be ready for adoption in April/May.

   The Rancheria will be recruiting for a Garden Coordinator for the Tribal Community Garden.

   City of Sebastopol:

   Kenyon Webster reported that work is ongoing on the General Plan (it is over halfway complete).

   A joint meeting of the Commission and City Council is scheduled in April to address the Climate Action Plan.
Three hotel projects are in progress at different stages of construction.

Mr. Webster next reported on the potential installation of bicycle lanes along Highway 116. A grant had been applied for previously for this project, which was not granted, however; CalTrans will be doing paving work on Highway 116 in this area, and this may be an opportunity for them to include the addition of bicycle lanes. This will require that some parking be eliminated, and that some lanes in certain areas be eliminated.

A feasibility study is in progress for a bicycle route between Sebastopol and Petaluma.

In response to Committee questions, Mr. Webster reported little activity in residential projects.

City of Cotati:

Jon-Paul Harries reported on increased residential activity, including a few large multi-family projects and major public works projects, particularly on Old Redwood Highway at Highway 116. This includes a significant sidewalk enhancement and streetscape project.

Additional improvements will be taking place along the historic corridor area, particularly for bicycles and pedestrians. These will include sidewalks, new paving, and crack repair.

Public works projects include sidewalk, ramps, and other improvements.

Mr. Harries announced that the Urban Growth Boundary will be expiring in 2018, and staff is working to place this on the 2016 ballot.

Staff is working on the Strategic Plan and examining future projects.

The issue of medical marijuana is also under consideration. Staff is working with City Council to determine what direction it wishes to take on this matter.

Sonoma County PRMD:

Amy Lyle of PRMD reported on upcoming meetings and public workshops addressing community separators. This will be addressed at the next Committee meeting. Staff is pursuing placing this as a ballot measure for November.

Ms. Lyle next announced the approval of a vacation rental ordinance. Staff is examining exclusion zones for these rentals.

Staff is working on Climate Action 2020.

Staff is also working on a hazard mitigation plan and on a sea level rise grant, focusing on the coast, including an adaptation plan for Jenner and Bodega.

The Airport Land Use Commission has approved an Airport Land Use Plan.

5. Homelessness Toolbox – Sonoma County presentation

This was tabled to be rescheduled in the absence of Sonoma County Department of Health Services.


Ms. Lyle reported that staff has been requested to “fast track” this issue; the goal is to have a policy developed by the end of the year.

Staff met with the Economic Development Board. Ms. Lyle reported that they will be conducting a six-month study of the impact medical marijuana dispensaries have on the local economy.

Discussion followed regarding policy for each of the jurisdictions, and how outreach is conducted, as well as public safety issues, and what the community wants.

Mr. Webster reported that Sebastopol has adopted a medical marijuana ordinance, and that there have been no issues with the single dispensary that is allowed within their city limits.

Ms. Lyle added that staff will report back on this issue.

7. Moving Forward 2040 – SCTAs Comprehensive Transportation Plan update – land use sections to be sent for review.

Ms. Spilman reported that this is currently at the editing stage in-house. She is seeking housing information from the Committee. She explained that the PDA investment growth strategy will be incorporated into this Plan.

Staff is anticipating that this will be available for review and approval by the next Committee meeting. Ms. Spilman summarized some new
features; the layout, performance measures, project analysis and goals. She further explained that the Board seeks to know what policies have an impact on reaching goals.

Ms. Spilman noted that the Plan does not call for implementation or specific policies, or recommendations.

Staff is also reviewing Climate Action 2020.

8. Other Business /Next agenda
The Regional Transportation Plan and Homelessness Toolbox will be addressed in the next agenda.

9. Adjourn
10:39 a.m.
Sonoma County Community Development Commission

Building HOMES

A Policy Maker’s Toolbox for Ending Homelessness

April 12, 2016
Building HOMES

A Policy Maker’s Toolbox for Ending Homelessness

> **HOUSING:** What are the needs?

> **OPTIONS:** What can be done?

> **MEASUREMENTS:** What is the goal?

> **ENGAGEMENT:** Who can help?

> **STRATEGIC ACTION:** What is the plan
2015 Homeless Count

- **3,107** people homeless on a single night
  - 1,037 (33%) – Sheltered
  - 2,070 (67%) – Unsheltered

- **5,574** people homeless annually
  - Exceeds 1% of County’s population

- **27% decrease from 2013**
  - 3 times national rate
Homeless Demographics

- 87% - Single Adults over age 18
- 22% - Unaccompanied Youth under age 24
- 12% - Families with Children

**Special needs:**
- Adults with Mental Illness 57%
- Victims of Domestic Violence 36%
- Adults with Substance Abuse 31%
- Chronically Homeless 23%
- Veterans 7%
- Adults with HIV 2%
## 2015 Homeless Count by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the Cities</th>
<th>Unschooled</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>964</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,472</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015 Homeless Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Cities but in Region</th>
<th>UnsHELTERED</th>
<th>SHELTERED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated - North County</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated - South County</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated - West County</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated - Sonoma Valley</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated - Central Santa Rosa</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>565</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>625</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The table above presents the 2015 Homeless Count, categorizing homeless individuals by their location outside of cities within the region. The data includes information on those who are unscholed and those who are sheltered, along with the total count and the percentage of the region's homeless population they represent.
Current Housing Market

- Rental vacancy rate is below 1%
- Rents **increased 30%** in last 3 years
  - Added to 46% increase from 2000 – 2012
  - Average rent ~ $1,600
  - Over 50% of very low-income households pay more than 50% income for rent

![Graph showing residents spending >30% of income on housing](chart.png)
Incomes Needed

- Average rent ~ $1,600/month - $18,000 annually
- Need $46,000 household income;
- Full time Minimum Wage Earner: $18,720
- Average wages* (full time):
  - Registered Nurse: $69,110
  - Education, Library & Training: $50,782
  - Janitor: $22,130
  - Hotel Maid: $23,000
  - Vineyard worker: $10,000 to $12,500
  - Sales and related: $38,792
  - Food Preparation & Serving: $24,211
  - Office & Admin. Support: $40,740
  - Farming, fishing and forestry: $26,124

* = October 2015
US Bureau of Labor Statistics - Santa Rosa MSA

IF you find a place to live
Housing First

“Housing First” approach resolves homelessness

- Placement in permanent housing
- Supportive services provided after stabilized in housing
- Higher success in treatment outcomes
- Higher rate of housing retention
- Reduced use of crisis services, hospitals, jails, other institutions

The solution to homelessness is permanent housing.
Housing = Cost Savings

- Permanent supportive housing averages $31/day
- People who are homeless use more expensive interventions including:
  - Emergency rooms
  - Hospital stays
  - Arrests
  - Incarceration
- Net savings even when including cost to build new housing

Cost Per Day in Supportive Housing, Treatment, Jail, & Hospital, Sonoma County 2014-15
Housing Units Needed

- **2,200** homeless-dedicated units needed
  - Throughout all areas of County

- **200** in existing housing units
  - Set-asides in affordable housing developments
  - Rapid Re-Housing: short/medium-term subsidies
  - Section 8: long-term rental subsidies
  - Shared housing
  - Mix of unit sizes
Housing Units Needed

2,000 new units
- New homeless-dedicated development
- Rehabilitation of substandard housing units
- Adaptive reuse of underutilized non-residential properties
- Most for single adults
- 400 to serve needs of youth
- Most 220 - 400 square feet
Portable Units

- Types include:
  - RVs and travel trailers
  - Tiny houses
  - Cargo container homes

- Advantages
  - May be less expensive to develop
  - Can move to alternate locations as needed

- Disadvantages
  - May not have heat / utilities
  - Do not resolve homelessness
  - Do not qualify for most federal & state subsidies
Permanent Units

- Types include:
  - Single-room occupancy (SRO)
  - Small apartments
  - Manufactured housing / park model homes
  - Tiny houses if larger than 220 sf & on permanent foundations

- Advantages
  - Qualify for federal & state financing
  - SROs & apartments allow for higher development densities
  - Compatible with urban infill

- Disadvantages
  - Greater time & cost to develop
Interim Measures

- Interim measures used when housing is not available
  - Reduce suffering & keep people safer
  - Make connections to services & housing

- Interim measures can include:
  - Emergency & transitional facilities
  - Safe overnight vehicle parking areas & camping areas
  - Sanitary & food preparation facilities
  - Tents, yurts, sleeping boxes, conestoga homes

- Not optimal path for resolving homelessness
  - Reduction in on-going operational funding
Cost to Develop Housing

- Typical affordable apartments ~ $350,000/unit
- Homeless-dedicated apartments ~ $160,000/unit
  - Smaller units to serve singles
  - Simple design
  - Modest amenities
- Park model homes & tiny houses ~ $172,000/unit
  - Lower densities due to single-story construction
  - Higher construction / site development costs
Cost to Develop Housing

- 2,000 new units needed
- $160,000/unit average small apartment cost
  - $105,000/unit estimated federal & state subsidies
  - $55,000/unit estimated local financing needed
- $110 million local investment required
  - All jurisdictions
  - Spread over ten years
  - Alternatives may be implemented to reduce costs
What can be done?

- Existing resources are insufficient
- Alternatives are available
  - Financing options
  - Policy options
  - Land use options
  - Regulatory incentive options

"The solution to homelessness is permanent housing."
Financing Options

- **Federal funding resources**
  - Low-Income Housing Tax Credits
  - Federal Home Loan Bank - Affordable Housing Program
  - Community Development Block Grant & HOME
  - National Low-Income Housing Trust
Financing Options

➢ State funding resources
  o Multifamily Housing Program
    • Supports deeply affordable housing
  o Veterans Housing & Homeless Prevention Program
    • $550 million targeted for veterans who need housing with services
  o Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities
    • Focused on greenhouse gas reduction
    • Urban areas served by public transit
  o New Permanent Source?
    • $75 recording fee
Financial Options

- Local resources – Public
  - Low/Mod Income Housing Asset Funds
  - Redevelopment Residual Receipts
  - Inclusionary Housing Fees
  - Commercial Linkage Fees
  - Transient Occupancy Tax
  - Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts
  - Housing Revenue Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Residual &amp; Asset Distributions (all years @ 7/31/15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY GENERAL</td>
<td>$19,785,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CLOVERDALE</td>
<td>$71,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF COTATI</td>
<td>$1,419,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF HEALSDBURG</td>
<td>$3,566,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF PETALUMA</td>
<td>$3,513,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF ROHNERT-PARK</td>
<td>$2,404,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANTA ROSA</td>
<td>$1,872,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SEBASTOPOL</td>
<td>$1,276,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SONOMA</td>
<td>$1,463,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OF WINDSOR</td>
<td>$1,788,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals - County and Cities</td>
<td>$37,161,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financing Options

➢ Local resources – Private
  ○ Private Fundraising
    • Direct donations to non-profit agencies
    • Funds could be leveraged
    • SAY Dream Center successful model
  ○ Endowments
    • Funded by legacy and other donations
    • Earnings could support services
  ○ Employment Based Visa – Type 5
**Financing Options**

- **Local resources – Public / Private Partnerships**
  - **Housing Trust Fund**
    - Funding for developments countywide
    - Funds contributed from all jurisdictions
    - Access to private capital
    - Patterned on successful models, adapted for Sonoma County’s unique needs
  - **Pay for Success**
    - Similar to LIHTC
    - Funds for services
Policy Options

- Impact fees
  - Base fees on unit size

- Development assistance incentives
  - Higher priority for funding
  - Deeper per unit subsidies

- Rental assistance
  - Preference for homeless people
  - Project-based vouchers for homeless-dedicated units

- Use of public facilities
Land Use Options

- **Zoning densities**
  - Zone suitable sites at higher densities

- **Publicly owned & surplus land**
  - Make available for housing on favorable terms

- **Development readiness measures**
  - Subsidize site assembly, infrastructure, impact fees
Regulatory Incentive Options

- Density bonuses
  - Create / expand local programs that exceed State-mandated 25% bonus
  - Grant bonuses based on floor area

- Housing overlays
  - Allow housing development on commercial & industrial parcels
Who can help?

Collaboration –
- Everyone working together towards one solution
- County / City collaborative
- Health care, Education. Business, labor, Environmental Community

Community Acceptance
- Neighborhood relations
- Community outreach & education
Strategic Action

- Engagement
  - Countywide Housing Summit
  - Leadership Group
  - Inter-jurisdictional Working Group
  - Regional Housing Coordinator

- Geographic Distribution of Affordable Housing
  - County/City agreement for proportionate number of units to be accommodated in each jurisdiction
Strategic Action

- Investment Policies
  - Revise County CDC policies to require & provide deeper subsidies for homeless-dedicated units

- Rental Assistance Programs
  - Allow County Housing Authority to provide 140 project-based vouchers for homeless-dedicated units

- Pilot Projects
  - Tiny Homes
  - Palms Inn
Strategic Action

Expand / Develop New Revenue Resources

- Countywide Housing Trust Fund
- Inclusionary Housing and Commercial Linkage Fees
- Redevelopment Residual Receipts
- Transient Occupancy Taxes
- Housing Revenue Bonds
- Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts
- Pay for Success
Strategic Action

Optimize Land Use & Reduce Development Costs

- Establish impact fees based on unit size
- Zone appropriate parcels at higher densities
- Require development at zoned densities
- Allow density bonuses based on floor area
- Create / expand housing overlays
- Construct infrastructure improvements at suitable sites
Strategic Action

➤ Enhance Incomes
  o Ensure access to job training & employment support
  o Assist in obtaining disability benefits

➤ Tenant Protection Measures
  o Coordinate with cities to research feasibility countywide

➤ Interim Measures
  o Approve expanded/new programs to keep people safe until housing is obtained.
Measuring Success

Collaborative, strategic action can achieve the goal

- Create 2,200 homeless-dedicated housing units
- **Increase incomes** from employment & benefits
- Increase health care coverage rates

**End homelessness by 2025**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless-Dedicated Permanent Housing Units</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Homeless Count</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Experiencing Homelessness In One Year</td>
<td>5,574</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Work plan – Adopted January 12th, 2016
- Next Steps
- Begin collaborative engagement!

The solution to homelessness is permanent housing.