*** EXTERNAL MESSAGE ***

Hello,

Here are my comments and questions on the housing element being discussed tonight. All page number references are to the element's pagination.

1. On page 5, it states that the city made a comprehensive effort to reach lower- and moderate-income individuals to participate in the Housing Element Update. I'm not sure that is the case. Did the city reach out to Tenant groups (like the Pinole Grove Tenant's Association) or allied entities (like ACE)?

2. On page 10, we get information on letters sent to the city by outside groups commenting on the draft element. I think the first we were informed of those letters on the Planning Commission was in January of 2023, and the first time we saw their concerns detailed in writing is with this draft element just now. Why didn't we see them earlier?

3. On page 11, Outreach "to Developers" was added to the title of Program 3. Given the aims of the program, where does outreach to Developers fit in?

4. On page 12, the city asserts that it has had excellent production of very low, low and moderate income units. I think that is a reasonable assertion for low and moderate income, but we still have a substantial gap for very low. Could we have it say moderate production of very low and excellent production of low and moderate income units?

5. On page 30, there's a breakdown of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment in Table 3 that splits out extremely low. Are we required to build 60 extremely low income units as part of the RHNA? I note the footnote says "required to project", but I don't know if it also implies "will be required to build".

6. On page 34, table 7 I found it interesting that the percentage of white (non-hispanic) and white (hispanic) population in Pinole declined, but the overall Hispanic population did not. Do we know whether that's due to population changes or changes in self-identification?

7. On page 49, Figure 6 is poorly designed. The colors for Bay Area and Pinole are very similar, and the symbols are all identical. I'd recommend using different symbols for the various lines and changing the bay area color to a different hue entirely, rather than slightly darker blue.

8. I think it's important to note on pages 49-50 the fact that the cost to purchase a home (not accounting for interest on mortgages) is approaching 8 times the median income in the city. The core point being made there is solid- but having the raw multiplier there would help.

9. On page 51 and 52 it's noted that 3 bedroom apartments cost less between April and August of 2022, and even after that 2 bedroom prices have remained very close to 3-bedroom prices. Table 25 on page 53 shows that the fair market rent for a two bedroom

unit should be $732 less than a 3 bedroom one, but Figure 8 on page 52 shows that 2 bedroom prices are at most 200 dollars less than 3 bedroom ones. Why are 2 bedroom prices at and remaining so markedly above the fair market rate, given that 3 bedroom prices are much closer to it? This would seem to have significant implications for any programs the city pursues to reduce severe overpayment by renters.

10. Table 29 on pages 56 and 57 shows major overpayment burdens for low income renter and owner households in Pinole. However, it's based on data from 2014-18 (when, as table 24 on page 51 notes, rents in Pinole were significantly lower). Would it be possible to get more current data, especially given the spike in rents in 2022 (for larger apartments) shown on Figure 8 on page 52?

11. On page 69, it's noted that the PITC data for 2022 was unreliable, and so the city is going off of the 2020 PITC. When do we expect to see the 2023 PITC report, and if it shows variance with the 2020 one will the element be updated?

12. On page 72, the element notes that the police department estimates that there are currently between 5 and 10 unhoused persons in the city. How comparable is the police department's methodology to the county's PITC? Would it tend to count more, less, or around the same amount?

13. On page 75, the element states that 12.4% of the population of Pinole is living with at least one form of disability. On page 76, it states that no single point in the city (as shown on figure 12 on page 77) has a population of greater than 10% with at least 1 disability. How does that work?

14. On page 83, I think it's important to highlight that over half of extremely low income households (in 2018) owned their dwellings (which implies longer tenure and greater age). The default assumption the public has for that income category does not include homeownership. Like in question 10, when can we get more current CHAS data from HUD?

15. On page 100, the city mentions pursuing the creation of an in-lieu fee for affordable housing as part of Program 7. Would the level of that fee account for the decreased value of the funds when they are ultimately used, given that it will probably take multiple projects worth of fees to fund another project, leading to cost inflation?

16. On page 100, RC should be defined in one of the last 2 paragraphs for reference in table 60 on page 101.

17. As I stated in the planning commission meeting on the 27th, I strongly dispute the assertion on page 105 that the OIMU area is the most walkable corridor of the city given that a. the old town sub-area exists and is far more walkable and b. that there are outright gaps in the sidewalk infrastructure along San Pablo Avenue leading from the OIMU area into the rest of the city (which I would argue rise to the level of needing to be remedied by a Complete Streets program for San Pablo Avenue to match the one the city currently has for Appian).

18. There are a few minor typographical errors on pages 106 and 107- were twice where there should be where, and I think Transitional housing is not permitting should read Transitional Housing is not permitted (107).

19. It's good to have the concrete data for exactly how long the permitting process works for multiple examples on pages 111-113. Would it be possible to create a bar chart with times for each stage to allow for easier comparisons within and across the projects?

20. Table 65 (pages 117-18) seems to be lacking quite a few comparison fees across various categories. Does that mean that Pinole is the only city that charges fees there, or is the data simply unavailable?

21. On page 119, the regional fee comparison states that fees are comparable to and typically lower than nearby cities as shown in table 65. I'm not sure that table 65 actually shows that.

22. On page 123, there's a mention of a covered/concealed construction policy. Is that a hidden plan, or literal underground construction?

23. On page 127, financing availability states that "low interest rates are expected to prolong the availability of financing". This is no longer accurate.

24. On page 131, it states that the city is in discussions with ConFire on a contractual arrangement. This should be changed to has agreed on, I think.

25. On page 136, programs an affordable should read programs and affordable.

26. I think it's important to note that though the city is inter-city integrated (by comparison to contra costa county race ratios as per studies mentioned on page 156), it's still intra-city segregated at a moderate level as per the data on page 147 and figure 21 on the same page. We're doing better than Contra Costa County, but we shouldn't overestimate how well we are doing, which I'm worried page 156 does.

27. Do we have no post-2010 data for Housing Choice Voucher usage in Pinole, as page 150 seems to imply?

28. Given the disparities in environmental conditions, economic opportunity and amenities listed elsewhere in the housing element, I'm not sure that the "no significant disparities" on page 156 and "RHNA sites are relatively distributed throughout the City and are not anticipated to exacerbate any fair housing concerns" on page 157 holds.

29. On page 164, it states that a difference of .3 in environmental opportunity score is "essentially in the same range". I don't agree- if a gradient block is .25, falling outside of that is a significant difference.

30. On page 168, are the tree tracts should read are the three tracts.

31. Figures 42 and 43 on page 171 have some odd gaps. Are there really no native american or pacific islander households in Pinole that have any housing problems?

32. Given the significant increase in rents from 2020 to 2022 (figure 8, page 52), I think it would be helpful to update figure 45 on page 173 to show more current overpayment data.

33. Page 177 notes that there are 6 identified popular homeless locations. Does the city have a policy on encampments?

34. Page 182 states that maps and data show relatively subtle differences between census tracts. As per my previous questions, I dispute this. I also think it would be worthwhile to reach out to the Pinole Historical Society for information on past discriminatory practices in Pinole.

Thanks, Rafael Menis

Resident of Pinole