Manchester, Nancy

From: Amanda Miranda <amandamiranda7906@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:26 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Si me podrían dar más información porfavor mi número celular es 4152995128

Manchester, Nancy

From: Andrew Smith <a.asmith@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 7:25 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Substantial Amendment 2019 -2020 Annual Action Plan

Greetings,

One of my pet peeves in getting housing built and low income housing built is the government mandates that drive up the cost of getting the housing built in the first place. We read stories of the state of California and Santa Rosa having mandates on energy and solar panels for new housing. Making policy and rules on whether to install all electric or gas appliances. Outrageous CEQA costs that seem to do nothing other than enrich those that are the recipients of the services. The list seems to go on and on.

Santa Rosa is in transition trying to catch on the rebuilding of the homes lost in the Tubbs Fire. Some areas just about rebuilt. Others a good percentage built.

The more finished the more construction workers are available to shift to other housing projects. So the labor issue does not hold up more non-single family housing built.

One big issue of course is where to put low income housing. Always a touchy issue if put in areas near upper middle to well to do areas. And the projects have to make sense for the area. Can't have too much housing in an area where traffic is a big concern. And once our economy opens up again, traffic will be a returning issue.

Ideally putting low income housing near public transportation as many would use the bus and train systems. But parking still needed as the bus and train systems don't always work for low income people. Plus can't go too high in height for housing because this is not an urban city but a suburban and rural city.

I do like the idea of buying existing low income housing to preserve it. As good as building new low income housing so it does not get changed.

Santa Rosa is fortunate to have lots of open, big lots in the western area. Perhaps look at these lots and see if any make sense for low income housing. Maybe the owner will sell and money to build available.

Andrew Smith
Santa Rosa

Manchester, Nancy

From: art tomaszewski <artski1@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 8:20 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing

Hello,
I saw that south bay,San Jose, had used unoccupied mall parking lots. They bought used camping trailers to house the homeless. Why not give them a area to call home. If they choose. They could have common facilities and occupy a small unit as their own. I know some would still sleep on the street and do drugs but maybe the majority would want a little structure in their lives. Personal ownership,safety and shelter comes with a price.
Art.

Manchester, Nancy

From: Brenda Gilchrist <brenda@thehrmatrix.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 1:35 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy; Schwedhelm, Tom; _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN
Attachments: IMG_6179.JPG

Dear Nancy and City of Santa Rosa Council Members, and Mayor of Santa Rosa

Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020

RE: SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input regarding the proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP).

I oppose the Plan being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.

I oppose the Action Plan amendment that will allow rapid deployment of the City's existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness.

Based on our city's current state of affairs and financial situation, as a city that is struggling financially and one that is still reeling from the devastation of the 2017 Tubbs Fire and 2019 Kinkade Fire, I oppose this proposal. In 2019, there has been over $136 million in grants, services and programs allocated to homeless services (see attached graphic). The millions invested in our local homeless crisis has not decreased the number of homeless. As such, I oppose funds that are already earmarked for other services to be diverted to fund homeless services.

At this time there are multiple unsanctioned encampments all over the City in public spaces, residential neighborhoods, in front of businesses and schools and in our parks. There are hundreds of homeless illegally camped out and that have already been offered shelter, which a majority on the street repeatedly refuse. We have provided trash service, food services, toilets, and hand washing stations and spent over $12m on the LG project that was supposed to be temporary, and the problem has gotten worse.

Diverting an additional $1.3 Million to "acquisition, construction, etc...of property" is not a good use of these funds, and will further attract and enable addicts and mentally ill, that are causing havoc on the city, its residents, businesses and waterways. The homeless have continued to buy, sell and use illegal drugs, vandalize and trash areas they occupy and commit crimes

throughout the surrounding areas. As everyone can see, the multimillons of dollars this city has spent has not solved or resolved the addiction and mental health crisis, that is negatively impacting the lives of all our residents and our businesses throughout the city.

In lieu of diverting these funds, I propose the funds remain in its place and be used for its intended purpose. As such I oppose all aspects of this proposal and feel it will be a misappropriation of funds if they are diverted to other purposes that they were not initially intended for.

I encourage all our city leaders to direct its efforts to developing strategies and programs that address the addiction and mental health crisis. Solutions, such as high barrier shelters and facilities that are court ordered, with treatment services and follow up drug court and programs, should be our city's focus. Housing First, low barrier shelters, unsanctioned encampments and RV parking is further enabling this problem. As you are all aware, we have groups that are recruiting new transients to our area, which is not sustainable, nor should it be allowed.

Regards,

Brenda Gilchrist
3574 Alkirst Court, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
707-526-0877

Manchester, Nancy

From: Chris Carrieri <chris@c2alts.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 7:08 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy; Kuykendall, Kelli
Subject: [EXTERNAL] housing/homelessness

Hi, this is in response to the public input opportunity posted today. The City needs to get very proactive on setting up a camp for tents, cars & RV's with all the attendant services. (Safe Camp Program) It needs to have rules including for pets & be run by residents. This needs to be on public property ideally somewhat distant from neighborhoods yet have good access- such as county center parking lots. This needs to be established this spring as a pilot so perhaps more camps can be successfully created.

This can allow better enforcement around city parks & nearby streets that are causing such divisive disgust in the community & on Next Door. Opening Parks for non-drive-in recreation to the public is rather inane when they cannot be enjoyed as designed currently. Council has never to my knowledge created public discussion on this shelter less tool that has pilots & models in place in other cities.

What is the status of the Housing Policy Subcommittee? The page seems to be unreachable on the city site; furthermore the FAQS & other documents mostly seem to be from 2+ years ago. The more this drags on, including costly potential sheltered housing projects, the more consternation & ridicule grows in the n'hoods that the city is useless-creating even more problems.

Chris Carrieri
C^2: Alternative Services
758 Pine St.
Santa Rosa CA 95404
Office: 707/568-3783
Fax: 707/575-6866
chris@c2alts.net

www.c2alts.net

Manchester, Nancy

From: Chris Vetrano <chris707@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 12:58 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Yet Another Irresponsible Action

First please stop referring to addicts and vagrants as “those who are experiencing homelessness” like they were just down on their luck.
These are people who are choosing NOT to help themselves and are ruining our community. Refer to them as vagrants, addicts and criminals.

How dare you limit public comment to three days?

Below are my sentiments exactly, written by another member of the CAN group.

Dear Nancy Manchester and City of Santa Rosa City Council Members, Mayor of Santa Rosa, City Attorney and City Manager.

Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020

RE: SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input regarding the proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP).

I oppose the Plan being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.
I oppose the Action Plan amendment that will allow rapid deployment of the City’s existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness.

Based on our city's current state of affairs and financial situation, as a city that is struggling financially and one that is still reeling from the devastation of the 2017 Tubbs Fire and 2019 Kinkade Fire, I oppose this proposal. Due to the most recent investment of close to $136 million in homeless services, that have not improved our situation or decreased the number of homeless, I oppose any additional use of any more funds being diverted to fund homeless services.

At this time there are multiple unsanctioned encampments all over the City in public spaces, residential neighborhoods, in front of businesses and schools and in our parks. There are hundreds of homeless people illegally camped out and that have already been offered shelter, which a majority on the street refused. We have provided trash service, food services, toilets, and hand washing stations and spent over $12m on the LG project that was supposed to be temporary, that the city extended and spent more than was initially approved.

Diverting an additional $1.3 Million to "acquisition, construction, etc...of property" is not a good use of these funds, and will further attract and enable addicts and mentally ill, that are causing havoc on the city, its residents, businesses and waterways. The homeless have continued to use illegal drugs, vandalize and trash areas they occupy and commit crimes throughout the surrounding areas. As everyone can see, the multimillons of dollars this city has spent has not solved or resolved the addiction and mental health crisis, the is impeding and negatively impacting the lives of all our residents and our businesses, particularly in downtown Santa Rosa.

In lieu of diverting these funds, I propose the funds remain in its place and be used for its intended purpose. As such I oppose all aspects of this proposal and feel it will be a misappropriation of funds and take away from the funds initial purpose.

Regards,
Chris Vetrano

Manchester, Nancy

From: Crystal Prairie <coastcrystal@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 10:01 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment regarding Substantial Amendment to Annual Action Plan

I am absolutely AGAINST the use of any more funds being diverted to fund homeless services. At this time there are multiple encampments all over the City in public spaces. Next to my place of business off of Corporate Center Parkway there are many homeless people illegally camped out and they have already been provided trash service, toilets, and hand washing stations. Railroad square is inundated. Freeway overpasses, street corners on Santa Rosa Avenue, and numerous other public spaces are being taken over by the homeless population. Millions of dollars have already been thrown at this problem and OBVIOUSLY this is not helping the current situation, and is actually making it worse. I believe that the original intent of this funding is not being upheld. Funneling $1.3 Million to "acquisition, construction, etc...of property" is NOT a good use of these funds, and will further enable, and even ATTRACT, addicts and mentally ill. This will only make this public health and safety crisis worse, and harder to solve.

I do believe that using the funds for rent, utilities, and mortgage assistance to those who need it, in order to PREVENT homelessness, is a good use of the funds.

~*~*~*~*~*~*
Crystal Prairie
CoastCrystal@Gmail.com
~*~*~*~*~*~*

Manchester, Nancy

From: Schurman, Daniel <Daniel.Schurman@stjoe.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 8:40 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Input on Amendment to Plan for Housing Needs Amid the Coronavirus Pandemic
Attachments: St. Joseph Health Letter of Support to Santa Rosa City Council Housing Amendments.pdf

Please find attached a letter of support regarding the Housing Amendment.

Dan Schurman, MNA
COMMUNITY HEALTH INVESTMENT MANAGER
ST. JOSEPH HEALTH, SONOMA COUNTY

1450 Medical Center Drive, Suite 1
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
T: (707) 522-4352 C: (707) 479-8475 F: (707) 522-1279
daniel.schurman@stjoe.org
www.stjosephhealth.org

St. Joseph Health
Santa Rosa Memorial • Petaluma Valley

St. Joseph Health
Santa Rosa Memorial

May 12, 2020

Santa Rosa City Council
City Hall
100 Santa Rosa Ave,
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendment to the Annual Action Plan for FY 2019/20 Housing Program

Dear Mayor Schwedhelm and Members of the Santa Rosa City Council:

On behalf of St. Joseph Health and Santa Rosa Memorial, I am writing to express our strong support for the draft amendments to Santa Rosa's FY 2019/20 Annual Action Plan for housing and housing programs needs. These amendments will benefit low- and moderate-income residents impacted by COVID-19 by providing much needed financial assistance to make their rental payments.

At St. Joseph Health, we believe health is a human right. Everyone deserves the chance to live the healthiest life possible, especially those who are poor and vulnerable. But it's not easy to take care of your health when you don't have a safe place to call home. Our founding sisters understood better than anyone that housing and health care are inextricably linked. Keeping people in their homes during this public health crisis will not only keep families secure, but will also reduce the spread of this disease.

The record number of unemployment claims and small businesses in crisis requires a community response that prevents residents from becoming newly homeless or without the ability to pay utilities. St. Joseph Health believes that in these trying times, short term solutions such as these will provide immediate relief and support to our vulnerable residents, and we commend your actions to address this issue during this pandemic.

Sincerely,

Dan Schurman
Manager, Community Health Investment
St. Joseph Health – Sonoma County

Manchester, Nancy

From: Jacqueline <marcuszmarcus@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:56 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Relief for Landlords

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would just like to ask that when creating policies, you also consider the landlords as equally valuable parts of the public housing puzzle when trying to seek solutions.

We are owners of some commercial residential property near downtown Santa Rosa which includes 7 very affordable housing units. We have kept the rents almost the same since the day we purchased the property 15 years ago. Rents for our two bedroom homes with backyards range from $1000-$1130 per month. I know we could get about two to three times that rent, but we have tenants who have been with us since we purchased the property, and we have always felt that as long as we are covering our mortgage and taxes, and making a little to live on, it was okay because we were providing nice and affordable places for people to live.

However, we retired a year ago, and now we are more dependent upon rents for our income, and now some of our renters are unable to pay their rent, and it is a large burden for us because we will eventually run out of savings to cover property expenses not to mention our own living expenses.

Often there seems to be talk from the City almost demonizing landlords and encouraging landlords to waive or lower rents due to the pandemic. I just wanted people who are setting policy to be aware that this is not really possible for all of us. We don't have a pension, and social security only goes so far.

Also, when the City is considering rent control, please be aware that some of us owners have been "controlling" the rents ourselves and should not be punished if we ever find ourselves in the position that we will need to raise the rents to come more into line with the markets, especially since our commercial property taxes keep escalating.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely, David & Jacqueline Marcus

Manchester, Nancy

From: Eva Quiroz <evarquiroz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 11:20 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy; Schwedhelm, Tom; _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSITION LETTER

Dear Nancy and City of Santa Rosa Council Members, and Mayor of Santa Rosa

Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020

RE: SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input regarding the proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP).

I oppose the Plan being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.

I oppose the Action Plan amendment that will allow rapid deployment of the City's existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness.

Based on our city's current state of affairs and financial situation, as a city that is struggling financially and one that is still reeling from the devastation of the 2017 Tubbs Fire and 2019 Kinkade Fire, I oppose this proposal. In 2019, there has been over $136 million in grants, services and programs allocated to homeless services (see attached graphic). The millions invested in our local homeless crisis has not decreased the number of homeless. As such, I oppose funds that are already earmarked for other services to be diverted to fund homeless services.

At this time there are multiple unsanctioned encampments all over the City in public spaces, residential neighborhoods, in front of businesses and schools and in our parks. There are hundreds of homeless illegally camped out and that have already been offered shelter, which a majority on the street repeatedly refuse. We have provided trash service, food services, toilets, and hand washing stations and spent over $12m on the LG project that was supposed to be temporary, and the problem has gotten worse.

Diverting an additional $1.3 Million to "acquisition, construction, etc...of property" is not a good use of these funds, and will further attract and enable addicts and mentally ill, that are causing havoc on the city, its residents, businesses and waterways. The homeless have continued to buy, sell and use illegal drugs, vandalize and trash areas they occupy and commit crimes throughout the surrounding areas. As everyone can see, the multimillions of dollars this city has spent has not solved or resolved the addiction and mental health crisis, that is negatively impacting the lives of all our residents and our businesses throughout the city.

In lieu of diverting these funds, I propose the funds remain in its place and be used for its intended purpose. As such I oppose all aspects of this proposal and feel it will be a misappropriation of funds if they are diverted to other purposes that they were not initially intended for.

I encourage all our city leaders to direct its efforts to developing strategies and programs that address the addiction and mental health crisis. Solutions, such as high barrier shelters and facilities that are court ordered, with treatment services and follow up drug court and programs, should be our city's focus. Housing First, low barrier shelters, unsanctioned encampments and RV parking is further enabling this problem. As you are all aware, we have groups that are recruiting new transients to our area, which is not sustainable, nor should it be allowed.

Eva Quiroz

Manchester, Nancy

From: pkuta <pkuta@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:14 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Cc: Basinger, Megan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Notice of Public Comment Period - Substantial Amendment to Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan

Greetings!

Thanks, Nancy and Megan. I read the proposed changes, and don't have any additional comments. It didn't appear to me to substantially impact local homeless or low income in general - enough to circulate to those I normally keep in my emails. The work of responding to the County's Consolidated Plan and One Year Action Plan for Housing seems like a higher priority. This week, I'm trying to absorb those recommendations and write up a report for circulation.

But I very much appreciate your staff work, and your efforts to keep us informed and participatory. Looking forward to the next time you seek our comment.

Gregory Fearon

> On May 5, 2020, at 9:16 AM, Manchester, Nancy <nmanchester@srcity.org> wrote:
>
> If you no longer wish to receive notices from the City of Santa Rosa regarding opportunities to comment on the City's plans for use of its HUD grant funds, please respond to this email and I will remove your name from the outreach list.
>
> .
>
> <image001.png>

Manchester, Nancy

From: Heather Anderson <drhgriffith@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 9:21 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Amendment comment

Dear Nancy,

Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020

RE: SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input regarding the proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP).

I oppose the Plan being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.
I oppose the Action Plan amendment that will allow rapid deployment of the City's existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness.

Based on our city's current state of affairs and financial situation, as a city that is struggling financially and one that is still reeling from the devastation of the 2017 Tubbs Fire and 2019 Kinkade Fire, I oppose this proposal. Due to the most recent investment of close to $136 million in homeless services, that have not improved our situation or decreased the number of homeless, I oppose any additional use of any more funds being diverted to fund homeless services.

At this time there are multiple unsanctioned encampments all over the City in public spaces, residential neighborhoods, in front of businesses and schools and in our parks. There are hundreds of homeless people illegally camped out and that have already been offered shelter, which a majority on the street refused. We have provided trash service, food services, toilets, and hand washing stations and spent over $12m on the LG project that was supposed to be temporary, that the city extended and spent more than was initially approved.

Diverting an additional $1.3 Million to "acquisition, construction, etc...of property" is not a good use of these funds, and will further attract and enable addicts and mentally ill, that are causing havoc on the city, its residents, businesses and waterways. The homeless have continued to use illegal drugs, vandalize and trash areas they occupy and commit crimes throughout the surrounding areas. As everyone can see, the multimillons of dollars this city has spent has not solved or resolved the addiction and mental health crisis, the is impeding and negatively impacting the lives of all our residents and our businesses, particularly in downtown Santa Rosa.

In lieu of diverting these funds, I propose the funds remain in its place and be used for its intended purpose. As such I oppose all aspects of this proposal and feel it will be a misappropriation of funds and take away from the funds initial purpose.

Regards,

Heather Anderson
--

Heather Anderson

Let the beauty we love become the good we do. ~Rumi

--

Heather Anderson

Let the beauty we love become the good we do. ~Rumi

Manchester, Nancy

From: Mr. James A. Weber <weberjames@juno.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 11:39 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Coronavirus recovery efforts

Dear NManchester,

Having devoted a larger than average share of my attention by focus as well as default, to what seems to me something short of a pandemic, at least, in certain areas, including Sonoma County (2 deaths in 7 weeks), I would urge that any additional funding received for "Coronavirus recovery efforts" simply be used for reseeding, on some impartial scale, those businesses that actually stand a chance of surviving. As with any shortage, I think businesses must be judged by some template that indicates a track record of prudent operation, so that the funds will end up in the hands of those who have shown historically, their prowess at expanding the local economy. This will help ensure that these additional resources do not suffer the fate of a mere handout, functioning instead as an investment more so than a relief effort.

Thanks for your attention,

James A. Weber
912 Keegan Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
707-396-6018
weberjames@juno.com

Manchester, Nancy

From: Jocelyn Chapman <jocelyn@monitor.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 6:20 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Homeless camp in Howarth Park

Hi,

I live in the neighborhood that backs to Sullivan Ridge Trail behind Howarth Park, where there now appears to be a homeless camp. A few evenings ago I was gardening and saw a man with a backpack veer off the trail towards my house, until he saw me. He veered in another direction, seemingly looking for a place to camp. This definitely frightens me. Just a couple years ago firefighters dragged hoses through my yard to put out a mysterious fire:

https://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/8932110-181/small-fire-under-control-at

Please do not turn parks into homeless camps or allow people to stay there. Thank you.

Jocelyn Chapman

Manchester, Nancy

From: John Walthall <jpw063@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 5:17 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy; Schwedhelm, Tom; _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Dear Ms Manchester, City of Santa Rosa Council Members, and Mayor of Santa Rosa

Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input regarding the proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP).

I oppose the Plan being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.

I oppose the Action Plan amendment that will allow rapid deployment of the City's existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness.

In summary, I do not agree with diverting funding from planned programs that benefit the tax paying citizens living in Santa Rosa for the purpose of coddling the homeless population that continue to refuse services because they don't want the restrictions and responsibilities that come along with living a fruitful life as a citizens of this state and our country. I am all for helping good folks that are homeless for valid reasons but have zero empathy for the majority of the homeless population that are either addicted to drugs/alcohol or mentally ill and refuse help. Until such time that our state governments require accountability of the homeless receiving these benefits I oppose spending another one of my hard earned tax dollars giving them a free ride.

California and more specifically Santa Rosa has become a destination for homeless because they know it is an easy gig with plenty of perks. I live adjacent to Taylor Mountain Park and have donated countless hours of my personal time cleaning up the messes that the homeless sleeping in their cars dump overnight because the city has failed to provide the services necessary to keep the area clean and clear of illegitimate overnight activities. Instead it is your citizens donating their own time in an attempt to keep the areas clean and useable by the good people it is intended for. I moved back to California 2 years ago from Colorado where I lived adjacent to open space that was kept prestine by the community and state, I expected Taylor Mountain open space to be a similar oasis. I could not be

more disappointed with what I have experienced here in Santa Rosa and California these past 2 years.

The homeless have continued to buy, sell and use illegal drugs, vandalize and trash areas they occupy and commit crimes throughout the surrounding areas. As everyone can see, the multimillions of dollars this city has spent has not solved or resolved the addiction and mental health crisis, which is negatively impacting the lives of all our residents and our businesses throughout the city.

In lieu of diverting these funds, I propose the funds remain in their place and be used for their intended purpose. As such I oppose all aspects of this proposal and feel it will be a misappropriation of funds if they are diverted to other purposes that they were not initially intended for.

I encourage all our city leaders to direct their efforts to developing strategies and programs that address the addiction and mental health crisis. Solutions, such as high barrier shelters and facilities that are court ordered, with work programs, treatment services and follow up drug court and appearances should be our city's focus. Housing First, low barrier shelters, unsanctioned encampments and RV parking is further enabling this problem. As you are all aware, we have groups that are recruiting new transients to our area, which is not sustainable, nor should it be allowed.

Respectfully,

John P. Walthall

Manchester, Nancy

From: Kelly K Lombardi <kellyklombardi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 10:43 PM
Cc: Manchester, Nancy; Schwedhelm, Tom; _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020

Dear Nancy and City of Santa Rosa Council Members, and Mayor of Santa Rosa

Please accept this letter as my public comment to the CITY OF SANTA ROSA PUBLIC NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH MAY 12,2020

RE: SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input regarding the proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP).

I oppose the Plan being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.

I oppose the Action Plan amendment that will allow rapid deployment of the City's existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness.

Based on our city's current state of affairs and financial situation, as a city that is struggling financially and one that is still reeling from the devastation of the 2017 Tubbs Fire and 2019 Kinkade Fire, I oppose this proposal. In 2019, there has been over $136 million in grants, services and programs allocated to homeless services (see attached graphic). The millions invested in our local homeless crisis has not decreased the number of homeless. As such, I oppose funds that are already earmarked for other services to be diverted to fund homeless services.

At this time there are multiple unsanctioned encampments all over the City in public spaces, residential neighborhoods, in front of businesses and schools and in our parks. There are hundreds of homeless illegally camped out and that have already been offered shelter, which a majority on the street repeatedly refuse. We have provided trash service, food services, toilets, and hand washing stations and spent over $12m on the LG project that was supposed to be temporary, and the problem has gotten worse.

Diverting an additional $1.3 Million to "acquisition, construction, etc...of property" is not a good use of these funds, and will further attract and enable addicts and mentally ill, that are causing havoc on the city, its residents, businesses and waterways. The homeless have continued to buy, sell and use illegal drugs, vandalize and trash areas they occupy and commit crimes throughout the surrounding areas. As everyone can see, the multimillions of dollars this city has spent has not solved or resolved the addiction and mental health crisis, that is negatively impacting the lives of all our residents and our businesses throughout the city.

In lieu of diverting these funds, I propose the funds remain in its place and be used for its intended purpose. As such I oppose all aspects of this proposal and feel it will be a misappropriation of funds if they are diverted to other purposes that they were not initially intended for.

I encourage all our city leaders to direct its efforts to developing strategies and programs that address the addiction and mental health crisis. Solutions, such as high barrier shelters and facilities that are court ordered, with treatment services and follow up drug court and programs, should be our city's focus. Housing First, low barrier shelters, unsanctioned encampments and RV parking is further enabling this problem. As you are all aware, we have groups that are recruiting new transients to our area, which is not sustainable, nor should it be allowed.

Kelly Lombardi
1555 Sonoma Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Manchester, Nancy

From: Kevan W Brown <kevan.brown@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020 11:48 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment

I am absolutely against spending more tax dollars on homelessness.
I am absolutely against diverting tax dollars to fund services for homeless. You are now giving away our parks and streets to them, so now I am against any future requests for additional taxes to fix, repair or maintain our parks and streets.
Kevan Brown

Sent from my iPhone

Manchester, Nancy

From: Kevan W Brown <kevan.brown@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 7:45 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment on homelessness

I am absolutely against spending more tax dollars on homelessness.
I am absolutely against diverting our tax dollars to fund services for homeless. You are now giving away our parks and streets to them, so now I am against any future requests for additional taxes to fix, repair or maintain our parks and streets. I hope you remember this when you ask us for more money each election.

Kevan Brown

Manchester, Nancy

From: Lynn McGarvey <mcgarvlu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 6:56 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing

Housing priorities must start demanding contractors include housing for our workers as they get permits to build more expensive houses. We must work to a balanced community instead of the NIMBY city we have become! Watching Fountaingrove rebuild bigger, with even more to burn, no services, more car trips, not built for walking, or bikes. No schools. Pathetic planning!

Lynn McGarvey, 4683 Quigg Drive, Santa Rosa. 537-6632.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

Manchester, Nancy

From: Manjeet Beall <manju_beall@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 9:44 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing

Dear Sir
We have a garage in our house and it is livable and has nice floor and walls and electricity set up for one person to live in and is comfortable!
We already have someone live in this room! Is this alright due to the current situation?

Mrs Beall
Sent from my iPhone

Manchester, Nancy

From: Marie Nagtalon <marie6nagtalon@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 9:27 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please Fix Our Housing Crisis

Below is my proposed stimulus package:

STIMULUS PACKAGE

The purpose of the government is to protect the life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness of its current and future citizens. While capitalism and democracy are idealistically just and free, both systems need to be implemented in a way that provides its citizens access to food, water, shelter, and basic medical care with minimum effort, ability, and at an affordable price. Due to economic factors outside most citizen's control, the cost of living has gone up exorbitantly making it difficult for many honest Americans around the country to thrive in the supposed democratic, free, and capitalistic society they find themselves in. Many citizens have turned to supporting communism or "democratic socialism" thinking this will solve everything not knowing that this will only increase their vulnerability to be exploited even further. There is a place in any society for competitive pure capitalism but not when it involves food, water, shelter, or other basic necessities required to function normally in society.

EACH US CITIZEN - FEDERAL FUNDS

Each US citizen 25 years or older can choose between one $50,000 lump sum amount to pay directly towards existing personal debt OR $1,500 per month for 3 years or until the citizen's net income exceeds $250,000. If a citizen has less than $50,000 of debt, the remaining balance of the lump sum amount will be provided to the citizen directly tax free. All US citizens between the ages of 16 and 21 will receive $26,000 of funds for further education and $1,000 per month once 21 for 2 years.

RESIDENTIAL REAL ESTATE

Only US Citizens 18 and older may buy single-family homes. No more than a total of three (3) homes may be owned by any US Citizen and permanent county resident at one time in the county. Citizens whose permanent residence is outside the county are allowed to own only one (1) single family residence inside the county. Multiple homes or dwellings on one parcel of land are counted as one home. All existing home ownerships are grandfathered in at the time this law is passed but citizens or non-citizens whose ownership exceed the maximum allowable number of homes will be fined $35,000 annually for each property owned exceeding the allowed number of single family homes beginning three (3) years after this law is passed. Additionally, homes owned by US citizens or non-US citizens whose primary residents is outside the county will be fined an additional $5,000 in property taxes for owning a home inside the county. Any property inherited by a new owner is allowed a two-year grace period to sell properties exceeding the allowed number specified above. Companies are not allowed to buy residential property and will be expected to rent from the communities they are doing business in. The following are included when referring to a single-family home: condo, town-home, single-family home. The following are excluded and considered exempt: apartment complexes, mobile homes, new residential construction until sold to first buyer, fire rebuild construction until house has completed construction and sold to new owner, hotels, commercial buildings, and mixed-use buildings. Hostels in residential communities are not exempt.

BANKS

Banks should require 10% to 20% down on all home loans in the county. Banks are required to foreclose on homes that have missed 6 or more mortgage payments. Banks can renegotiate final sales price of the home to avoid foreclosing on

the home. Banks are fined $5,000 per month for owning foreclosed single-family homes longer than three (3) months. Banks are fined $35,000 per month after 9 months for owning single family homes.

EXPLANATION/REASONING

This community was built by men and woman devoted to establishing a place where young and old alike could live vibrant happy fulfilling lives. Allowing multiple residential homes to be owned by the rich limits the ability for younger generations and younger families to establish themselves in this community leading to homelessness and people leaving California in the hopes they can find a better life in another state. Something needs to be changed for the future of this community and for the future of California. Flipping homes has lead to a disproportionate increase of inflation in housing in the area. Flippers and income rentals do not take pride in the homes they are flipping or own and it does not better the long term future of the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Marie Nagtalon

619-886-0085

Manchester, Nancy

From: Mark Krug <MKrug@burbankhousing.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 3:53 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Notice of Public Comment Period - Substantial Amendment to Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan

Nancy,

Can you please clarify something for me. There's language in the Substantial Amendment document on the website about using CDBG and CDBG-CV for public services yet the regulatory citation (24CFR § 570.203(a-c)) is for economic development activities. The sentence after the citation is also regarding economic development ("These activities include but are not limited to: acquisition, construction…").

I think of "public services" in CDBG terms as separate and apart from "economic development" activities. So, I'm confused about the intent to repurpose some CDBG and for the use of CDBG-CV.

Mark

From: Manchester, Nancy <nmanchester@srcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 9:16 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy <nmanchester@srcity.org>
Cc: Basinger, Megan <MBasinger@srcity.org>
Subject: Notice of Public Comment Period - Substantial Amendment to Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan

[CAUTION----FROM EXTERNAL EMAIL]

If you no longer wish to receive notices from the City of Santa Rosa regarding opportunities to comment on the City's plans for use of its HUD grant funds, please respond to this email and I will remove your name from the outreach list.

.

City of Santa Rosa

NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

The City of Santa Rosa would like your input on its proposed substantial amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan (Plan) that was approved on May 7, 2019 and its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP). The Plan is being amended to shift HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from one eligible activity to another and to account for additional Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) signed into law on March 27, 2020.

The Action Plan amendment will allow rapid deployment of the City's existing CDBG and new CDBG-CV funds for public services to provide new and expanded support services for persons experiencing homelessness; the City's additional HOPWA allocation will provide enhanced HOPWA services; and the existing HOME funds will be used for Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA).

Beginning on May 5, 2020 the Draft Substantial Amendment to the 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan and the Draft CPP will be available for public comment. The Plans will be available electronically on the City's website at https://srcity.org/767/State-Federal-Reports. Due to the Shelter-in-Place order, hard copies will not be available for review at physical locations but electronic review copies may be requested by emailing nmanchester@srcity.org.

The CARES Act waived the typically required 30-day public comment period to expedite adoption and implementation of the proposed activities under the substantial amendment and provided authority to shorten the public comment period to five (5) days.

The public comment period runs from May 5, 2020 until May 12, 2020.
Comments may be sent to:

Nancy Manchester, Program Specialist II
Department of Housing and Community Services
City of Santa Rosa
nmanchester@srcity.org

The City of Santa Rosa does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admissions or access to, or treatment of or employment in, its programs or activities. Disability-related aids or services, including printed information in alternate formats, to enable persons with disabilities to participate in public meetings and programs are available by contacting the Administrative Technician at (707) 543-3300 one week prior to the meeting/program.

This information can also be accessed via the internet at: http://www.srcity.org.

Manchester, Nancy

From: mariaochu <mariaochu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 10:14 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] More funding

We need more assistance for single mothers for paying rent/ bills and food. I'm currently a salon owner and my 7 year old 90% of the time.
My rent is high for a 2 bedroom apartment. They have given my an opportunity to pay in increments each month but that just does not cut it...
With no income coming in I cannot deal with this situation for another couple months.. Can rent be 1/2 and or extra assistance for us who Normally work so hard and cannot make any extra income! PUA/ EDD is not enough.....

Thanks
Mary ochoa
(707) 480-9157
Sent from my iPhone

Manchester, Nancy

From: Nicole Cutler <nikkitbbfitness@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 6:26 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Affordable housing

Good evening,
I am a single mother of two daughters and I am finding it very hard to find affordable rent and housing not only during the Corona virus but in general. I am on the verge of losing my apartment and I don't know what to do so I believe that there needs to be something done to help us. Sonoma county is wonderful and beautiful and a great county to raise children in but it is simply not affordable for me. Unfortunately, I cannot move because due to my divorce agreement if I move out of Sonoma county I lose custody of my daughters. I would really appreciate any help that could be offered

Thank you for your time,
Nicole Cutler

Manchester, Nancy

From: Basinger, Megan
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 3:32 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Public comment on City Amendment to HUD funding

Will you compile the correspondence into a pdf and I will upload? I will need to be tomorrow mid-day

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Manis, Dina
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 3:04 PM
To: Goldfine, Kate; Trupiano, Nicole
Cc: Williams, Stephanie; Basinger, Megan; Lane, Rebecca
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Public comment on City Amendment to HUD funding

Kate/Nicole – If you want this or any other correspondence received related to this item attached to the Legistar file, please upload it as Attachment 1 as a PDF. Also, if you do this, please update the Attachments portion of the Staff Report to include Attachment 1 – Correspondence.

Thanks,

Dina

From: Goldfine, Kate <KGoldfine@srcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Trupiano, Nicole <NLopez@srcity.org>
Cc: Williams, Stephanie <SWilliams@srcity.org>; Manis, Dina <dmanis@srcity.org>; Basinger, Megan <MBasinger@srcity.org>; Lane, Rebecca <RLane@srcity.org>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Public comment on City Amendment to HUD funding

Yes it is going to Council on 5/19. I suspect you got it as the Housing Authority Recording Secretary, but don't know for sure.
I'm copying Stephanie, Dina, Megan, and Rebecca on this reply.
Thanks,
Kate

From: Trupiano, Nicole <NLopez@srcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 1:06 PM
To: Goldfine, Kate <KGoldfine@srcity.org>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Public comment on City Amendment to HUD funding

Hi Kate,

Not sure why I received this public comment, is this an item going to Council? If so I can fwd to the Clerk's.

Thanks!

~ Nicole

From: Rachel Marcus <rachel.s.marcus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 12:59 PM
To: Trupiano, Nicole <NLopez@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment on City Amendment to HUD funding

Dear Ms. Trupiano,

I am a Santa Rosa City resident and want to submit public input on the city's proposal to shift HUD funding into a rental assistance program.

As a tenant and as a person who cares deeply about the financial impact of shelter in place on our community, **I support this plan to allocate HUD funding to rental assistance.** Applying this funding towards rental assistance will assist more families in being able to stay in their homes than would applying the same amount of funding for constructing new units.

I believe those drafting the proposal should consider the following recommendations to make sure that the money has the largest impact for renters who are struggling:

1. Provide assistance for rent payments beginning in June. For those who receive rental assistance and had been unable to pay rent in March, April or May, **forgive these rent payments** with a condition that the tenants cannot be evicted for lack of payment once the pandemic is over. Paying back rent will make the money run out much sooner, and it is unreasonable to expect that tenants who are out of a job or have reduced hours could expect to cover the full amount of rental payments that they were not able to pay during the first few months of shelter in place.

2. Create pathways for undocumented families to apply for rental assistance

3. Supplement the funding with other city money as this fund will run out quickly.

Thank you!
Rachel Marcus
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Manchester, Nancy

From: Ramona Crinella <ramonacrinella@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 2:51 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Substantial Amendment to FiscalYear 2019/2020

Dear Ms. Manchester,

I oppose this proposed Amendment to Fiscal Year 2019/2020. It should be apparent to anyone who has studied the homeless problem in Santa Rosa that nearly all the efforts to help the homeless have been a failure. Just take a drive through downtown, through our underpasses and over to Doyle Park Drive and see what is happening despite the millions spent so far. $136 million was spent on the homeless here just last year. The problem is worse than ever. "Housing First" is an abject failure.

My understanding is that 73% of the homeless here are inactive addiction. So called "low barrier housing" does not address the problem.

Ramona Crinella

Manchester, Nancy

From: shore alborz <lorizonrose@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 12:36 AM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing

I was on the sec 8 list for 5 years before they decided to change whole program it's bullshit I woulda been almost come up to get my voucher and now I'm in danger of coming. Homeless with my kids Sent from my iPhone

Manchester, Nancy

From: SusanV <suzseed@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 10:03 PM
To: Manchester, Nancy
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Citizen Participation Plan

I wanted to address your request for input regarding public funding for various things.
I believe I speak for many people based on what we discuss on social groups regarding these issues.

1) Would like to see our tax payers money to help homeless people who do not choose to be homeless due to choosing to take drugs. Make a policy such as drug tests to be taken to prove haven't been on drugs for a period of time to earn money from the hard working tax payers. 'm tired of acting as a co dependent and enabling them along with taking care of them.

2) Would like to see funds go to make sure homeless are not living in public paid places like parks and libraries. These places have become living rooms for the homeless so now families and children cannot even enter the public places they pay for.

3) Our funds should go to education to teach non English speaking people to speak English instead of the cost and labor of translators and writing all in English/Spanish. America teaches the children in English, we've always spoken English, others have always learned English, newer immigrants need to too.

4) Stop paying foster youths to do nothing until they are 25. I personally know several foster kids whittling away their young 20's years not working for they get paid to do practically nothing. They have told me they will start looking for a job when their gov't funds dry up. We are enabling bad work ethics.

5) More tax payers money should go to more services that the middle to middle/upper use so tax payers can benefit from all their hard work. How long must the hard working tax payers continue to pay for all those who choose not to work? Look around you, we all know a hand full of people who live off the systems. And there are many many systems to allow those who take advantage live comfortably and with things that I can't afford like new Iphones and vacations.

Please.

Susan Vomerding
Santa Rosa resident