

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [CDC-Public-Comment](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMISSION HEARING 07/16  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:21:37 PM

---

## EXTERNAL

To the Sonoma County Housing Authority and Community Development Committee

### Argument 1

Subject : Objection to Change in Waitlist Preference Policy (Section 4-III.C)

I am writing to formally object to the policy clarification in Section 4-III.c of the proposed PHA Administrative Plan, which states that homeless preferences will remain available even when waitlists are closed to other qualified applicants.

This change, while possibly well-intended, it's unfair to low-income residents who have been patiently waiting for assistance through the proper channels—people who work, have children, pay taxes, and follow the rules. Many of these applicants are also at risk of homelessness themselves, but are somehow still holding on through a combination of self-preservation and part-time work, gig work, or living in overcrowded conditions.

Prioritizing individuals simply for being homeless, without evaluating the cause or context of their situation (e.g., drug addiction, criminal behavior, or chronic non-compliance with treatment, or job requirements), sends the **WRONG** message. It penalizes those who are stable but struggling and rewards those who, in the majority of cases, are not making any effort to improve their own circumstances. It also promotes queue jumping at the expense of fairness and accountability. We have to stop coddling the homeless for the sake of aesthetics and require them to be self-sufficient in some capacity, like the rest of us, if they want help. In the end, you can not in good conscious fast-track individuals simply for being homeless (even if they have a high-risk factor score) but stand to **REMOVE** the preferences of the mentally ill who have recently been released from a mental institution? So, remove the people who don't choose for their mental stability to be a serious hurdle when it comes to obtaining stable housing, and switch them out to help the able-bodied adult homeless person instead. It makes total sense--**NOT**. Please reconsider these decisions since these changes help no one in this community who uses your services; they just satisfy the aesthetic of the town.

### Objection 2

Subject: Objection to Income Calculation Policies

I want to express my strong objection to several deeply concerning income-related policies proposed in the Administrative Plan, particularly those outlined in Chapter 6B regarding gross income calculations and the treatment of in-kind support as income. These policies are detached from the financial reality that working residents of Sonoma County face every single day.

The proposal to maintain the base eligibility and rent calculations on gross wages—before garnishments or taxes—is completely unreasonable. We never see that money. It's the government's cut of our work. Wage garnishments for things like child support or IRS debt are legally required and are automatically deducted. It's extremely misleading and harmful to assess us as if we receive income we actually never see or touch.

Instead of a simple and fair approach—like averaging our last 90 days of *actual* paychecks with the *real* amount we receive—you're applying math that inflates our income by the thousands and sometimes tens of thousands of dollars per year! That not only disqualifies people who genuinely need help, but it also places

others in higher rent tiers they can't actually afford. You are setting people up to fail—not succeed.

Additionally, I was shocked to see that in-kind support—such as groceries, babysitting or help with a utility bill once in a while from a friend or family member—is now being counted as income. This is absurd. Unless you have reason to suspect, on a case-by-case basis, that this individual is getting “gifts” for over half the stuff she needs to maintain stability, why would you do that? Why? These aren't steady earnings. They are acts of kindness—temporary lifelines from loved ones trying to help us survive when they can. If I don't eat because I have to pay my PG&E bill, and my aunt helps cover it, that's not income. That's humanity. It shouldn't be something we are now penalized for.

To make matters worse, the way income levels are configured and then used in regard to your rent rates for affordable housing in Sonoma County isn't even based on our own income. It's based on the Area Median Income (AMI)—not based on the actual income that the particular participant ACTUALLY earns. IF this is not true—please publicly clarify—but knowing it is, how is this fair to the people in need? In conjunction with all these other income and eligibility restrictions, how does this help really?

Lastly, I want you to imagine being in this situation. Not trying to “live off the government”, but needing some help in this crazy economy, especially in California. Your eligibility is being based off an inflated income that you don't actually take home, the diapers and other house hold toiletries your mom and aunt drop off every now and then is being counted as your personal income, then they take all that “income” you have and see if it matches up with the AMI in the neighborhood your trying to move to( 9 times out of ten it does NOT)—if it's not then you're paying the scaled rent amount for that income amount—not your own. But of course, all of this is only after the jobless but capable homeless adults, who are prioritized before you get their homes. You understand, right? God Bless America.

If the government really wanted us to stop needing them for basic human needs, then maybe one day, one of these governments, perhaps local, will take the strides for our take-home wages to reflect the actual cost of living in Sonoma County. But until then, the reality is we just can't keep up with the rates of rent. The system is broken. Let's ensure that this program changes in ways that actually benefit the recipients.

I urge the committee to reconsider.

We are the working class. We pay taxes. We follow the rules. All we ask is that the system be based on truth and logic, not spreadsheets and assumptions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the issues today.

Respectfully

[REDACTED]

Santa Rosa, CA

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, **do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [CDC-Public-Comment](#)  
**Subject:** ADA Violations at Sonoma County Section 8 Waitlist  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:10:16 PM

---

## EXTERNAL

To Whom What appears to be missing is that under Federal law which also supersedes all state laws, per Social Security Administration Full Extra Help Program:

“There are no asset limits for SSDI and additionally, are fully 100% eligible for any and all state and federal programs that provide extra financial help or other programs of extra financial support for those with SSI and with SSDI, all those programs cannot restrict or reduce or deny any benefits or services, medical, housing, or otherwise that would go to an SSI person, and cannot count assets as there are no asset limits for SSDI, or restrict on that basis, for dual, continuously enrolled in Medicaid and Medicare. Additionally, COLA increases in SSDI cannot any income legally, post original award date monthly amount. To deny an SSDI person for any program or service or reduce benefits is against Federal law, is illegal and discriminatory and a violation of Civil Rights law and ADA.”

Therefore, your asset limit sections are null and void for those with SSDI determination (who are dually enrolled and or qualified for Medicare and Medicaid as QMB or otherwise).

Also Note ADA Violations by Sonoma County/Santa Rosa/Sebastopol Section 8:

I am SSDI and was throw off of the Sonoma County Section 8 Housing Waitlist by Santa Rosa in approximately 2018 or 2019 post fires, when as a permanently disabled person under Section 811 the per disabled are to receive first priority of Section 8 housing placement, and with no 811 separate list available or otherwise, I should have been provided Reasonable Accommodation to get back on the list when I did not understand the notice. As a result, I was removed and displaced and experienced homelessness and housing instability continuing and could not afford to stay in the area, and experienced discrimination in housing in my former landlord who refused to have a “disabled person living there, did not accept disabled tenants to live there” in spite of prior tenancy to my permanent diagnosis, with much harassment and this and other sublets after, and onwards. It has caused me extreme financial hardship and mental and physical distress on top of already being a fire victim a VAWA and Homeless applicant. Under ADA law I should never have been removed from the Sonoma County Section 8 Wait List in Santa Rosa and Sebastopol, and I should also not have been removed from HUD project housing for being under a minimum income threshold, when the entire point of this housing is to house the low income disabled community such as myself, who have no other avenues. This must be remedied immediately with no open lists in California for years and no longer even able to get on the Sonoma County or Section 8 Wait Lists in spite of permanent disability and 10 years now of hardship from housing instability, and as a single female, I am more vulnerable as a population where prior to the fires, I could not even get on shelter wait lists for their discrimination of single women without children and who have service animals, in spite of a clean record and zero drug or criminal history. It is 2025 now and I am still not able to get on any Section 8 Wait Lists in all of Northern California, in spite of having formerly been on the Sonoma Section 8 Wait Lists. There should be no throwing the disabled

off of any wait lists, particularly with TBI who may need assistance with paperwork and other notices. I still require Reasonable Accommodation to get back on the list that was illegal to remove me from in the first place and is a violation of my Civil Rights and ADA Federal protections.

Signed,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, **do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.