

From: [Sonia Taylor](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: [Alton, Alan](#); [Osburn, Gabe](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Item 4.1, 4/9/24 Agenda
Date: Monday, April 8, 2024 7:09:20 PM
Attachments: [4 8 24 santa rosa impact fee ltr final 1.pdf](#)

Mayor Rogers and Members of the City Council:

Attached please find my letter regarding your Study Session Item 4.1 on tomorrow's agenda.

Thank you for your consideration, and, as always please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sonia

Sonia Taylor


Sonia E. Taylor
306 Lomitas Lane
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
707-579-8875

8 April 2024

Natalie Rogers, Mayor
Mark Stapp, Vice Mayor
Eddie Alvarez
Victoria Fleming
Dianna MacDonald
Jeff Okrepkie
Chris Rogers
Santa Rosa City Council

Via email

Re: Item 4.1, April 9, 2024 Agenda
Impact of Development Fee Waivers
Generation Housing "Right Size Impact Fees" Proposal

Mayor Rogers and Members of the City Council:

As we all know, jurisdictions charge impact fees on all new development to help cover the cost of the impacts of that development. Further, no jurisdiction can charge more than 100% of the cost of any impact, and most jurisdictions charge less than the full 100% of allowed recovery of impact fees.

To determine what impact various types of development have on a community, it is critical to have a recent nexus study which has evaluated those costs, so those costs can be accurately applied to new development. As is obvious, any impact fees not paid by new development must either be paid by all of a jurisdiction's residents from other resources, or, unfortunately, the impacts that would have been addressed by those impact fees simply don't happen or take longer to accomplish.

I opposed Generation Housing's original request for a 3-year waiver of impact fees, and very much appreciate the conclusions reached by the Staff Report for this item.

Generation Housing has now changed their request from a complete impact fee waiver to a substantial reduction in impact fees for some housing, including some market rate housing, as well as some increase in fees for large single family homes. I will address their current request in the remainder of this letter.

First, since Santa Rosa's last impact fee nexus study is from 2018, 6 years ago, I would urge you to move forward with approval of a new impact fee nexus study (as anyone who's been to the grocery store recently can tell you, the cost of everything has increased exponentially). With accurate and current information about Santa Rosa's future costs and needs, you will then be able to make fiscally responsible informed decisions, which is essential before consideration of Generation Housing's current "Right Size Impact Fees" proposal.

Right now, I don't believe you have adequate current information available for use in evaluating Generation Housing's proposal, so I would strongly urge you to table that proposal until completion of a current nexus study. To do otherwise would be putting the cart before the horse – you have no idea of the potential cost to Santa Rosa of implementing any part of Generation Housing's proposal.

With regard to what I believe to be Generation Housing's "Right Size Impact Fees" proposal, I have the following observations for your consideration:

1. I'm in favor of review and consideration of impact fees based on square footage, although, again, without a current nexus study, you don't have adequate information to make any decisions in this regard.
2. I'm in favor of review and consideration of some potential fee reductions for deed restricted legally affordable housing, keeping in mind that the costs don't disappear, and if those fees are lowered, the costs still have to be paid by all of Santa Rosa's residents from other resources. However, I don't believe you have adequate information to make any decisions in this regard now without a current nexus study.

When you get to this review and consideration, I would urge that you focus any reduced impact fees on the very most affordable housing, which is most difficult to build and which needs every dollar advantage it can get. Generation Housing's proposal, unfortunately, proposes the same fee reductions for very low and extremely low income housing as for low income housing (they start the reduction at 80% of AMI -- low income is 50%-80% of AMI, and it goes down from there). While the need for legally affordable low income housing is high, the need is even greater for legally affordable very low and extremely low housing. Further, Generation Housing's proposal increases the fees (less reductions) for larger legally affordable housing – while I understand the reasons for this proposal, unfortunately larger legally affordable "family" housing (3 bedrooms and above) is in very short supply, so the need is great. When you have this discussion, I'm not sure tying reduced fees for low, very low and extremely low income housing to the square feet of the unit makes sense for the community, and will be something for you to decide.

Deed restricted legally affordable housing provides a clear community benefit, so it's worth considering fee reductions, when you have a current nexus study.

3. I support review and consideration of raising fees to 100% of cost (which is the maximum that can be charged) for all market rate units – whether single family or multifamily – that are 2500 square feet or larger. Generation Housing's proposal would just raise the fees to 100% for 2500 square foot or larger single family homes, but just because a larger market rate unit isn't a single family home doesn't mean it's not high end housing.

Again, of course, you need a current nexus study to determine what 100% of impact fees would be, so consideration of this proposal should be delayed until you have that current nexus study.

4. I do not support a blanket reduction of impact fees for market rate housing. Generation Housing's proposal calls market rate housing by the euphemisms "affordable by design" and "workforce" housing, but no matter what they call it, it's still market rate housing, and will rent and/or sell for whatever the market will bear.

An unit of market rate “affordable by design” or “workforce” housing MIGHT be "more" affordable to the occupant, but there's no guarantee of that, since the developers will rent or sell the unit for whatever they can get on the open market. And, the impact fees those private developers don't pay will instead have to be paid for by every other Santa Rosa resident. These market rate units will pay property taxes, but those property taxes will in no way make up for the waived impact fees.

Any waiver or reduction of fees for market rate housing, no matter what euphemism it is called, is a gift of public funds to private developers, and I believe should only be given in the rare instance when you have determined that there is a clear community benefit for doing so.

In conclusion, I urge you to support preparation of a current impact fee nexus study to allow you to make fiscally prudent decisions, and also urge you to take no action on Generation Housing’s “Right Size Impact Fee” proposal until said current nexus study is complete.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Very truly yours,

Sonia E. Taylor

Cc: Alan Alton, Chief Financial Officer
Gabe Osburn, Director of Planning and Economic Development

From: [Gregory Fearon](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: [Pat Kuta](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Study Session on Affordable Housing Impact Fee Reduction
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 8:19:39 AM

Santa Rosa Affordable Housing Facts:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->1. The City is being asked by the development community to give them more money because they say they can't make enough money doing affordable housing.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->Santa Rosa's Regional Housing Need 2023-2031 indicates we are short 4,685 units, including 1,919 (41%) affordable for residents making less than 80% of our median income.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->Santa Rosa's Affordable Housing Project Pipeline contains twenty-nine projects with 2,383 units, including 1,468 of them (61%) affordable for residents making less than 80% of the median income.

Santa Rosa's current development density incentives and fee delays for affordable housing, combined with its offers of city parcels for development, seems adequate to meet our affordable housing demands without eliminating vital city housing impact fees.

Gregory Fearon


Santa Rosa, CA

From: [Bolla, Rhonda](#)
To: [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: We are counting on you to take action
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 12:37:51 PM

From: Jen Klose <jen@generationhousing.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 12:17 PM
To: Manis, Dina <dmanis@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: We are counting on you to take action

Jen Klose, J.D. [[she/her](#)] | Executive Director

[Schedule a meeting with me](#)

Click [here](#) to join Generation Housing as a member or renew your membership.

GenerationHousing.org

427 Mendocino Ave, Suite 100 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
707-900-GENH [4364] v | **310-663-6037 m** | 707-570-8768 f



Did you [read our open letter to the elected leaders of Sonoma County?](#) Your voice has never been more important - [sign the petition today!](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Caitlin Childs** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Apr 8, 2024 at 3:15 PM
Subject: We are counting on you to take action
To: <ealvarez@srcity.org>, <nrogers@srcity.org>, <JOkrepkie@srcity.org>, Rogers, Chris <crogers@srcity.org>, <vfleming@srcity.org>, <dmacdonald@srcity.org>, <MStapp@srcity.org>

Dear council members,

I've grown up in Santa Rosa, and I love this place deeply. But it's getting hard to love it here – my friends can't afford to live here anymore and have to move away, my siblings can't move back here, they could never afford to buy a house.

We've talked enough about housing, the crisis we're in, and potential solutions. It seems we've been talking forever. When my friends started leaving two decades ago,

that was a wake-up call. Or when I was part of the team behind the SAY Dream Center and we hit wall after wall of unnecessary and expensive opposition, that should have been a catalyst for simplifying the process for affordable housing. But here we are, still talking.

The truth is, all this talk about talking is just wasting more time – time we don't have. The best time to act might have been years ago, but the next best time? It's right now.

I'm beyond frustrated with study sessions that lead nowhere and staff reports fixated on financial costs, blatantly ignoring the broader social and environmental consequences of inaction. Santa Rosa is becoming increasingly unlivable, and this stagnation isn't just failing to address the issues—it's deepening them. Homelessness is still a visible and expensive problem, more people relying on the food bank than ever before, charities can't keep up with the demand and are shutting down, and the folks who work here are being pushed to live farther and farther away, adding to their commute and our traffic woes. These are real costs, and we can avoid them if we just start building more housing.

I understand the City isn't a housing developer and can't directly build homes, but you can treat this situation with the urgency it demands. The right-size impact fee solution proposed by Generation Housing is a step in the right direction—a pragmatic approach to a crisis that's been ignored for far too long.

We've waited long enough, and it's more than time to take bold action.

Thanks for listening.

Caitlin Childs



From: [Bolla, Rhonda](#)
To: [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Housing Shortage and a plea for help
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 1:09:27 PM

From: Jen Klose <jen@generationhousing.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 12:39 PM
To: Manis, Dina <dmanis@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Housing Shortage and a plea for help

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Rigel Bowen <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Apr 8, 2024, 4:12 PM
Subject: Housing Shortage and a plea for help
To: <ealvarez@srcity.org>, <nrogers@srcity.org>, <JOkrepkie@srcity.org>, Chris
<crogers@srcity.org>, <vfleming@srcity.org>, <dmacdonald@srcity.org>, <MStapp@srcity.org>

Dear Council Members,

I've had to move 7 times in the last 10 years because of how unstable the housing market is in Santa Rosa. Each move wasn't by choice; it was a necessity forced upon me by rising rents and scarce affordable options. I'm writing to you not just as a concerned citizen, but as someone directly impacted by what we all know is a deepening housing crisis.

We've seen enough discussion on this issue with little to show in the way of concrete solutions. The reality for many of us is a cycle of displacement and disruption that doesn't seem to end. And while I get that talking about the problem is easier than solving it, it's time for real action.

The consequences of not addressing this go beyond just numbers or reports. They're felt by people like me who have to uproot their lives far too often, by the increasing number of our neighbors without homes, and by our community organizations stretched to their limits. These issues affect all of Santa Rosa, leading to longer commutes, environmental strain, and a loss of community cohesion.

I understand that the City Council alone can't solve the housing shortage overnight, but you have the power to make decisions that can help. There's a proposal on the table from Generation Housing to adjust impact fees to encourage more housing development. This could be a practical step forward in addressing the crisis.

What I'm asking for is straightforward: let's prioritize practical solutions like this one that can offer some stability for residents. We need actions that match the urgency of the situation we're in. Let's make Santa Rosa a place where people don't have to move every couple of years just to afford a roof over their heads.

Thanks for considering this perspective.

From: [Adina Flores](#)
To: [CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: info@generationhousing.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Gen H / Development Fees
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 3:17:17 PM

Greetings,

I have major issues with Generation Housing (Gen H's) involvement with any housing matters within the County of Sonoma. At the time Executive Director Jenni Klose applied for Gen H to be included as a project of The Tides Center, she possessed \$85k in outstanding tax liens. I have requested to see the financials for Gen H from both the organization, as well as The Tides Center for two years. Rather than provide me with records, the entity decided to have the federal government threaten me by phone. I received a warning from the National Parks Police (NPP), as I indicated I would protest at The Presidio if they refused to supply me with the aforementioned documents. The NPP falls under the umbrella of the Department of the Interior, a donor to The Tides Center. When I mentioned this fun fact, the officer who threatened me was eager to end the phone call. I never heard from him again...

Ms. Klose is a Partner at Functional Zero Partners, Inc., a company which supposedly develops supportive housing. According to their [website](#), Ms. Jenni Klose and Mr. Akash Kalia "came together to transform the Palms Inn, a budget hotel in Santa Rosa, California, into a permanent supportive housing community for 120 previously homeless veterans and vulnerable individuals." Given that there was a recent [murder](#) and unfathomable living conditions at this privately owned but taxpayer-funded housing facility, the oversight of Functional Zero Partners, Inc. is problematic.

Casa de Tierras, Roseland was endorsed by Gen H as well. [MidPen Housing](#) will be completing the development. [Ms. Ali Gaylord](#), Secretary to the Gen H Board was the Director of Housing Development - North Bay at the time this project was approved. SR Councilmember Chris Roger's Board Chair for Sonoma County Conservation Action, Michael Allen is a Director for the Gen H Board as well. Mr. Keith Rogal, Governor Newsom's Carneros developer, was also a previous director. It appears that he resigned from the Board following an [article](#) I published regarding potential conflicts of interest.

It appears that these nonprofits are solely utilized for rent seeking, political indoctrination, and money laundering. If that is not the case, please explain North Bay Organizing Project / Undocufund and their affiliation with Santa Rosa City Schools Board President Omar Medina.

<https://www.instagram.com/p/C5i6El7RCzO/?igsh=MWQ1ZGUxMzBkMA==>

<https://www.instagram.com/p/C5ePllwy8zu/?igsh=MWQ1ZGUxMzBkMA==>

Thanks so much & God Bless.

--

Kindest Regards,

Adina Flores



From: [Michael Hilber](#)
To: [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Adina Flores comment attached here item 4.1 on 4-9-24
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 3:28:38 PM

RE: Gen H / Development Fees



me 3:17 PM



to _CityCouncilListPubli... ▾

Greetings,

I have major issues with Generation Housing (Gen H's) involvement with any housing matters within the County of Sonoma. At the time Executive Director Jenni Klose applied for Gen H to be included as a project of The Tides Center, she possessed \$85k in outstanding tax liens. I have requested to see the financials for Gen H from both the organization, as well as The Tides Center for two years. Rather than provide me with records, the entity decided to have the federal government threaten me by phone. I received a warning from the National Parks Police (NPP), as I indicated I would protest at The Presidio if they refused to supply me with the aforementioned documents. The NPP falls under the umbrella of the Department of the Interior, a donor to The Tides Center. When I mentioned this fun fact, the officer who threatened me was eager to end the phone call. I never heard from him again...

Ms. Klose is a Partner at Functional Zero Partners, Inc., a company which supposedly develops supportive housing. According to their [website](#), Ms. Jenni Klose and Mr. Akash Kalia “came together to transform the Palms Inn, a budget hotel in Santa Rosa, California, into a permanent supportive housing community for 120 previously homeless veterans and vulnerable individuals.” Given that there was a recent [murder](#) and unfathomable living conditions at this privately owned but taxpayer-funded housing facility, the oversight of Functional Zero Partners, Inc. is problematic.

Casa de Tierras, Roseland was endorsed by Gen H as well. [MidPen Housing](#) will be completing the development. [Ms. Ali Gaylord](#), Secretary to the Gen H Board was the Director of Housing Development - North Bay at the time this project was approved. SR Councilmember Chris Roger's Board Chair for Sonoma County Conservation Action, Michael Allen is a Director for the Gen H Board as well. Mr. Keith Rogal, Governor Newsom's Carneros developer, was also a previous director. It appears that he resigned from the Board following an [article](#) I published regarding potential conflicts of interest.

It appears that these nonprofits are solely utilized for rent seeking, political indoctrination, and money laundering. If that is not the case, please explain North Bay Organizing Project / Undocufund and their affiliation with Santa Rosa City Schools Board President Omar Medina.

<https://www.instagram.com/p/C5i6EI7RCzO/?igsh=MWQ1ZGUxMzBkMA==>

<https://www.instagram.com/p/C5ePIIwy8zu/?igsh=MWQ1ZGUxMzBkMA==>

Thanks so much & God Bless.

...



Reply



Reply all



Forward

