



MEMO

To: RHNA HMC Team
From: Civic Edge Consulting
Date: August 21, 2020
RE: August 13, 2020 HMC Meeting #9 Notes



Meeting Info

Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) Meeting 9
Thursday, August 13, 2020
Zoom Conference Webinar
[Recording Available Here](#)

Meeting Notes by Agenda Item

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Confirm Quorum – Jesse Arreguín, Fred Castro

2. Public Comment (Informational)

- When asked for public comments for items not on the agenda, there were no raised hands from attendees.
- Written public comment was received for Item 5.

3. Chair's Report – Jesse Arreguín

- Stressed that the main part of the meeting is discussion around provided materials and then decisions that will move the RHNA methodology forward. Mentioned the information from MTC/ABAG staff highlighting various proposed housing legislation related to RHNA and that specific questions around the bills noted should be directed to MTC/ABAG staff.

4. Consent Calendar

- No verbal or written comments to the Minutes from last meeting on July 9; motion carries with 3 abstains due to absence from last meeting.
- **Arreguin:** Called out AB 3107 (Bloom) and SB 1385 (Caballero) that were noted in the Zoom chat and that they died in committee. Reviewed the meeting structure and goals to decide on methodology baseline and income approach using modified consensus approach. Noted the next meeting on August 28 from 9:05AM – 12:05PM.

Encouraged robust group discussion so members could collectively contribute and decide things today. Shared that a modified consensus decision making approach would be utilized – and that attendees would be able to see how HMC members are weighing in. Thanked participants for feedback and engagement in the process, including improving question/answer.

Expressed that staff has heard desire to use the of PBA 2050 Draft Blueprint in the RHNA methodology, but there were significant concerns about the Draft Blueprint's heavy emphasis on growth in the South Bay, that led to smaller RHNA numbers for many jurisdictions throughout the rest of the region.

In response, staff have added some new options that would include use of the Draft Blueprint. The ABAG Executive Board will meet next week, and this committee will be updated with themes and feedback from that.

Zoom Comments before Refining the RHNA Methodology Report

- **Victoria Fierce:** good morning fam
- **Jane Riley:** Good morning Victoria!
- **Nell Selander:** Good morning, HMC members! I'm Nell Selander, with the City of South San Francisco, filling the seat on the Committee representing staff in San Mateo County.
- **Michael Brilliot:** Welcome Neil
- **Amanda Brown-Stevens:** Hi Nell! Welcome.
- **Monica Brown:** This is Monica Brown here
- **Fierce:** Thanks for the legislative report!
- **Matt Regan:** AB 3107 (Bloom) and SB 1385 (Caballero) both died this week.
- **Matt Walsh:** Item 5 is listed as an Information item. Can we take action on this?
- **Fierce:** Point of information: The chat lists it as "All panelists and attendees" in some versions now, instead of "Everyone".
- **Amber Shipley:** Thanks, Victoria! Yes, please select "all panelists and attendees" for chat!
- **Shipley:** Matt - re: Agenda item #5 as an informational item, my understanding is that "action" is understood as a roll call vote - and we're using modified consensus decision making today.
- **Jeff Levin:** Does that mean that at some future date we will be taking a roll call vote on the recommendations that we forward to the Board?
- **Fierce:** I don't see why we wouldn't, even if it's just to ratify what consensus is.

5. RHNA Methodology Concepts – Refining RHNA Methodology Concepts – Gillian Adams (Information Item)

- **Shipley:** Re-iterated the structure for the rest of the meeting, stating that committee members will pause for discussion and public comment before all decisions. Reminded everyone to send Zoom comments to "All panelists and attendees." Further, all requests of staff will be discussed at the end of this meeting to establish that staff will be able to provide responses in advance of the next meeting in two weeks.



Zoom Comments before Clarifying Questions

- **Brown:** Solano Unincorporated Areas do not have access to water, transportation etc. Was that taken into consideration in the urbanized land area?
- **Brown:** Will Gillian's essay explaining the PowerPoint be available online?
- **Shipleigh:** Yes - the staff report is a great (written) resource!
- **Brilliot:** Boy, bedroom [community], low-jobs San Jose sure stands out using 2019 with Blueprint.
- **Walsh:** It is still concerning that certain methods provide an unusually large allocation to unincorporated Solano. Much more so than its urban and suburban cities.
- **Ellen Clark:** Did Chair Arreguin say that this is expected to be a 4-hour meeting (i.e. until 2PM)?
- **Fierce:** That is correct, 2pm.
- **Riley:** Any methodology that pushes more housing (including market rate housing) into unincorporated areas without services is just bad planning.
- **Clark:** Thanks Victoria.
- **Fierce:** The presentation is up on MTC's site, and the video will be available there afterwards; a transcript would be great to have.
- **Kaplan:** As Gillian noted, the urbanized land area baseline is not included in any of the analyses today as staff did not find it to produce results consistent with statutory requirements and the HMC's goals.
- **Brown:** I printed all Appendix's I do not see the pages number?
- **Brown:** Thanks Victoria.
- **Kaplan:** The request for a transcript is noted.
- **Zippert:** An opportunity for clarifying questions is after the presentations.
- **Kaplan:** Page numbers refer to the packet PDF available [here](#)

HMC Members – Clarifying Questions

- **Diane Dillon:** Appreciated staff's hard work and the information provided. Also stated frustration with agenda that labeled this an informational item, when in fact it requires a decision point. Stated that packet did not properly prepare folks to make decisions today.
 - **Shipleigh:** Noted that the aim of this agenda item was to see if there was consensus among the committee members on these three items and, if so, to narrow the structure so staff could provide more refined support for the two remaining meetings.
- **Brilliot:** Expressed a desire to have more time to digest the packet of information. Stated that it felt difficult to select a baseline and then select factors because the two may impact each other and should therefore not be treated separately.
 - **Gillian Adams:** Stated that staff is trying to find the best way to narrow things down. Staff has heard frustrations about having too much information and is open to committee suggestions for refinement. Reiterated one advantage of the modified consensus process is that regardless of how the process goes, pieces can be revisited down the line.
 - **Shipleigh:** Noted that the committee can check in during the meeting to gauge if it is possible to come to a consensus. Any decisions that can be made will make



future decisions easier. If that is not possible, we will need to consider how to make the best use of our remaining meetings.

- **Riley:** Stated appreciation for the materials provided but noted that the more information received by the committee, the further away a decision feels. Urged the committee to come to some preliminary decisions today, to eliminate any options that will not meet the RHNA statutes. Expressed agreement with Brilliot about deciding on a baseline and approach separately. Asked a clarifying question about comparing the eight-year and thirty-year growth for consistency.
 - **Adams:** It is ensuring the total number of units a jurisdiction receives for the eight-year RHNA allocation is not larger than the amount of growth over thirty years projected in the Plan.
 - **Riley:** Expressed frustration that the comparison was not consistent, being eight years versus three decades, and therefore, they preferred considering the growth rate instead. It feels unreasonable to make that comparison.
 - **Dave Vautin:** Highlighted that this method gives HMC more flexibility since some places will grow faster in the near term, and others in the long term. Stricter consistency criteria based on growth rates would make it harder for the methodology developed by the HMC to be consistent with the Blueprint.
- **Aarti Shrivastava:** Acknowledged that it might not be possible to come to a decision on the baseline and factors today, they hoped that the committee could remove options that are duplicative so staff would have more time to develop a clearer packet. Agreed with Riley and Brilliot that the eight- and thirty-year comparison contributes to higher South Bay numbers. Suggested a modified metric instead.
 - **Vautin:** Clarified that with a stricter criterion for consistency, we would require higher RHNA allocations in South Bay to match 30-year Blueprint growth rates. The proposed approach allows more flexibility for the HMC to create a more even RHNA distribution.
- **Darin Ranelletti:** Question about how to explain everything to jurisdictions and public—what does it mean to use Plan Bay Area as a baseline? How do we simply explain the difference between an eight-year and thirty-year projection as a baseline and/or factor?
 - **Vautin:** Plan Bay Area 2050 is a policy-based plan that looks at how strategies, , such as transportation and housing policies, impact growth patterns in the region’s future. It leads to a growth distribution that focuses growth in a set of “growth geographies” including Priority Development Areas, but also looking at growth beyond them in transit- and resource-rich areas. I like to think of a car driving along the freeway: you can accelerate or decelerate for those near-term outcomes. Factors and weights can adjust to encourage different rates of near-term growth in specific areas. You are able to temper that Blueprint as a baseline, with acceleration or deceleration through factors and weights.
- **Neysa Fligor:** Appreciated the flexibility of the proposed middle path. Noted that Plan Bay Area 2050 will not be complete until the end of this year. Asked if the committee voted to adopt the middle path, as staff recommends it, would there be a risk of numbers changing dramatically following our final decision in September? Also, with regard to the objective metrics – are they statutory? What is the source of those objective metrics?



- **Vautin:** Acknowledged the potential for the Blueprint to change somewhat is an area of concern. Noted there may be some changes, but they would likely be small or moderate. Thousands of comments have been received this summer which will be informing revisions. The ABAG Board will be taking action on the final Blueprint and the methodology in the Fall. As we came to our staff recommendation, we felt that this one drawback was outweighed by the benefits of using the Blueprint in the methodology.
- **Fligor:** Are the objective metrics statutory? Since the committee will rely on these metrics to determine the best approach, what is the source of them?
- **Adams:** Stated that the evaluation metrics are organized around the five statutory objectives of RHNA. The metrics staff has developed are based on how HCD has evaluated the methodologies created by other regions, as well as ideas from the HMC and housing advocate partners that are all aligned with the statutory framework for what RHNA must achieve. All concepts move towards meeting these statutory obligations, but we have not had a modified consensus vote yet. At our next meeting we will explore that.
- **James Pappas:** Echoed appreciation for staff insight and the online tool. Agreed with staff recommendation to use 2050 household distribution. It captures and responds to today's household level and offers a good middle ground. Agreed that the bottom-up approach allows more flexibility, particularly, in addressing the statutory requirements for siting low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income housing. Noted the distribution of units is very similar to the current plan. Seems less radical than people might imagine – it is not the 44% to the south bay that is represented in the Plan. Responded to previous comments about selecting a baseline and factors separately, noting there are a lot of possible factors and the HMC has significant flexibility to refine the baseline with factors.
- **Selander:** Requested that the facilitator reference the page number of the best graphic during questions so committee members can refer to them.
 - **Shipley:** Yes, absolutely! Page five of staff memo presents the five options for the baseline staff is putting forward.
- **Fernando Marti:** Clarified two goals for the baseline allocation options. One goal is a more even RHNA distribution, instead of stacking it in three big cities. The other goal is to direct growth to high resource areas. Supported the idea to look at urbanized areas with different factors. Is there a possibility to combine some aspects of 2019 households with the 2050 Blueprint? Can we balance them out like we are doing with some of the other factors? The first two options really let the Tri-Valley area off the hook and focus on Silicon Valley.
 - **Adams:** There may technically be a way to do this, but a concern would be trying to explain the narrative that goes along with it. Suggested choosing a baseline that is best, and then manipulate factors around it. It is a simpler approach than layering baselines since we are already dealing with so many complications.
 - **Shipley:** Even if the committee does not decide on a baseline today, perhaps the group can eliminate some as options.
- **Elise Semonian:** Stressed that they have spoken with other planners in their county, but there has not been a lot of time to discuss deeper. Some communities have radically



different outcomes depending on different baselines. Stated a desire to bring information back to their jurisdictions for their input and feedback.

- **Levin:** How are we proposing to proceed? Is there still more time to mess around with the approaches and weights with the online tool?
 - **Adams:** Yes, correct.
- **Shiplee:** Opened discussion about what the committee would like to recommend to staff. How can we get closer to having fewer options on the table as we move to the next meeting? Are there options we can eliminate today?
- **Shrivastava:** Preferred to focus the 2019 Households and 2050 Households in the Blueprint, and to eliminate all the others.
- **Brilliot:** Agreed with Aarti to focus on 2019 and 2050 households.
- **Rodney Nickens, Jr:** Seconds it.
- **Semonian:** Agreed and preferred to move other factors.
- **Selander:** Preferred 2050 and 2019 households because they seem most reasonable.
- **Filgor:** Agreed with Elise but stressed that 2019 and the modified path are so close. Preferred to keep considering the Future 2050 Household Growth Method and eliminate 2019 Household option.
- **Susan Adams:** Agreed with using 2019 households as a baseline. Stressed that it was hard to know much about the future, particularly given current COVID-19 projections. Noted being more comfortable with using solid information we already have.
- **Pat Eklund:** Expressed confusion by the prompt to eliminate options and preferred to keep everything on the table for now.
 - **Shiplee:** Noted that narrowing down the baseline approach and structure will help the group recommend a methodology.
 - **Eklund:** Preferred to keep Blueprint 2050 and bottom-up.
- **Riley:** Preferred to keep Households 2019 and Blueprint 2050 as a baselines. Stated that they felt comfortable eliminating everything else to start discussing factors sooner.
- **Marti:** Agreed to keep 2019 Households as a baseline to study further. Stated a desire to see urbanized land factor data incorporated into the visualization tool. Then, wanted to discuss eliminating either income shift or the bottom-up approach.
 - **Shiplee:** Yes, we are hoping to eliminate one of those today.
- **Julie Pierce:** Noted that this was a lot of information to absorb in a short amount of time. Stated a desire to look at entire region, and not just their region. Urged the group to consider greenhouse emissions even though it is not a legal requirement. RHNA and the Sustainable Community Strategy should align as closely as possible. Expressed that we will not be able to meet our greenhouse gas goals without a massive shift. Stated that since we are unable to move the jobs, then the goal should be to put houses where the jobs are.
- **Mindy Gentry:** Stated that urbanized land area can be removed because it is problematic to place houses on the fringe. Doing so would not meet statutory requirements, not reduce greenhouse emission, increase transit congestion and decrease quality of life. It does not address a jurisdiction's ability to produce housing. Using 2019 Households is also problematic because it perpetuates the same issues that we as a region have done and does not look to a future of where we would be. It does not address housing supply needs close to jobs. Reiterated Julie's comment and supported continuing the conversation.



- **Carlos Romero:** Reminded the group that the baseline discussion is about the starting point, and not the ending point. Stressed that all allocation methodologies give significant weight to factors the committee cares about like jobs housing fit, jobs housing balance, and proximity to transit. Reminds everyone that we can apply many factors to adjust the baseline. Supports narrowing baseline to 2019 or 2050 Households. Asked about using urbanized land area as a factor. Stated that they were not interested in seeing urbanized land area as a baseline.
 - **Shipleigh:** We will add it to our list of requests and will review it at the end of our meeting.
- **Fierce:** Re-iterated how factors adjust the baseline. Stated a preference for the 2019 Households and 2050 Blueprint with the understanding that the factors will greatly influence it as well. Argued against the comment about enforcing the status quo since the factors were decided specifically to fight against that. Expressed that they are leaning towards 2050 Blueprint because it accommodates for the trajectory of growth more than it accommodates for previous mistakes.
- **Rick Bonilla:** Favored 2019 and 2050 baseline households and noted that the hybrid method Carlos mentioned feels difficult to envision. Noted that their primary goal is to get the most equitable outcome while reducing greenhouse gas emissions and congestion, while also making it easier for those who are struggling to live here.
- **Clark:** Echoed some other speakers in reasoning that they are leaning towards the 2050 baseline because weighting factors would fine-tune the numbers and adjust for less desirable impacts.
- **Tawny Macedo:** Echoed the desire for more equitable outcomes and reaffirmed the five objectives. Wanted to highlight some potential pitfalls in receiving HCD approval, based on how the methodology is built. The staff report and at the last meeting, questions were raised about demonstrating consistency. Reaffirmed that HCD is evaluating methodologies and allocations based on the five objectives of the statute. There are a few considerations to highlight: the department is open to approving a methodology that does not include the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a direct input to the plan. There is a statutory requirement to finish the draft RHNA allocation before the completion of the applicable regional transportation plan. Flagged that some factors, such as land use projections and future growth estimates limited by existing local land use plans, should not be considered in the RHNA allocation based on statutory guidelines. Cited the Council of Governments may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development based on existing zone ordinances. That said, HCD has approved the SCS as a component.
- **Dillon:** Expressed support for using 2050 Households with either Bottom-Up Three-Factor, or Income Shift. Noted having “grave concerns” about urbanized land definitions as it is presented.
- **Pappas:** Noted that many people seem to be talking about 2019 and 2050 households. Stated that the group needs to be thinking about the long-term plan outcomes. Summarized the key points of previous comments.
- **Shipleigh:** Re-iterating the consensus decision making process and reminded the group that we will be breaking soon.



Zoom Comments before Public Comment

- **Alia Al-Sharif:** As mentioned, all HMC requests of ABAG Staff made in the chat is being added to a Google document throughout the meeting. Towards the end of the meeting we will screen share the document and collectively review and prioritize the requests.
- **Al-Sharif:** Note to panelists: As a reminder, please ensure all chats are directed towards both "panelists and attendees" or "everyone" if that is how it appears in your chat.
- **Brown:** For example, I am looking at Appendix 6 potential RHNA bottom page states ABAG HMC Meeting #9 Item 5a Appendix 6 August 13, 2020. I still do not see a page number to match the Powerpoint.
- **Nickens Jr.:** I'd like to second Jane's recommendation.
- **Rupinder Bolaria-Shifrin:** Agree with Aarti!
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Let's get rid of what we can.
- **Selander:** Agree with Aarti and Rupinder.
- **Riley:** But that is staff's recommended consistency criteria, and on only one point - we do not have to use it.
- **Al-Sharif:** Monica - sorry for the confusion. If you are reviewing the packet on your computer you'll see the page number Gillian is referring to, but if you printed it, which it sounds like you did, you will not be able to view those page numbers. Appendix 6 starts on page 245 of the packet if viewing on your computer.
- **Dillon:** Could you please send now - Item 5A 2 Appendix 5 in an excel sheet (not pdf, as it is in agenda). Or link to it as excel sheet so I can print it in legible form? Thanks.
- **Brilliot:** I would suggest that we do preliminary votes and then come back at the end and discuss if the HMC is comfortable with the Baseline plus factor selected and take a final vote.
- **Shrivastava:** Rather than combining baselines, we can decide whether to use them as factors.
- **Shrivastava:** I agree with Michael.
- **Riley:** Agree Aarti.
- **Brilliot:** Yes staff, I am very impressed with your work. Thank you! I am usually on your side.
- **Shrivastava:** Great staff work. I agree.
- **Marti:** Yes, I'll amend my earlier comments: Rather than combining baselines, we can add urbanized land areas as an additional factor to either Households 2019 or 2050 Households.
- **Pappas:** I agree with Aarti.
- **Brown:** I want the bottom up allocation without the Blueprint.
- **Marti:** I also would like us to agree whether we can eliminate income shift and work on refining the bottom-up approach.
- **Kaplan:** Fernando, the request to add a land area factor has been noted.
- **Brilliot:** I agree with Fernando. Let's decide whether on whether to eliminate Income Shift and go with Bottom up.
- **Semonian:** I think we need to be clear when we talk about "Blueprint" which one, since there are two.



- **Riley:** If urbanized land area is going to continue to be considered, I am going to need a lot more information because it clearly sends growth to unincorporated areas where no services are available. Poor planning, increased GHG and VMT, etc.
- **Walsh:** I support keeping both 2019 Households and 2050 total households for consideration. Eliminate others.
- **Fierce:** The thing about unincorporated areas, is they're generally not urbanized.
- **Brown-Stevens:** I agree with Julie Pierce.
- **Riley:** Agreed Mindy!
- **Brown:** Thank you since we grow food like almonds.
- **Pappas:** Agree with Matt.
- **Brilliot:** Neysa, could you repeat your baseline recommendation? Was it to eliminate 2019 or was it to eliminate the 2050 Households Blueprint? Thought it was the former but just want to confirm I heard correctly.
- **Fierce:** Yeah what Rick said.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Thanks Rick and Victoria, I agree.
- **Selander:** In case it's helpful to anyone else, the graphs in Item 5a, Attachment 2, Appendix 2 seem to really sum up how all these options would play out. That appendix begins on page 98 of the PDF packet.
- **Levin:** Can people be clear when referring to the "Plan Bay Area 2050" baseline whether they mean the Plan Bay Area 2050 growth pattern or the Plan Bay Area 2050 household pattern?
- **Fierce:** Good point. I meant the household growth.
- **Clark:** My comment was also for PBA 2050 Households, as proposed by staff.
- **Fierce:** +1: to that order of operations.
- **Regan:** Adding urbanized land as a factor is a good idea.
- **Fierce:** Yeah, it's on the request list here for prioritization at the end of the meeting https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A8CmgpxBh7m_YoLEYPsJg_WpVNtduycbn6YDG_UupqAo/edit

Public Comment on Baseline Allocation

- **Noah Housh:** Appreciated all the staff work and new information. Stated concerns about incorporating Plan Bay Area Blueprint into the process since it adds a layer of complexity. Urged HMC to make decisions today and vote on the household data from 2019 and 2050 to simplify the process.
- **Diana Elrod,** Consultant representing the City of Lafayette: Urged the HMC to adopt the Blueprint as the RHNA baseline because it is the only option with forward thinking regarding housing growth in areas that jobs will be located. Noted that the other baselines would perpetuate historic land use patterns and would not achieve greenhouse reduction goals.
- **Anna Driscoll,** Enterprise Community Partners: Recommended using 2050 Households approach from the Draft Blueprint to focus on regional housing equity. Claimed that it allows an effective starting point for distributing housing needs and balances the current distribution and future trajectory for the region. Particularly since it involves important considerations identified by the group such as hazards and development feasibility. Noted that 2019 household baseline would be another strong option but felt all the



other options did not achieve RHNA stated objectives. Specifically, many options would perpetuate socio-economic and racial exclusion.

- **Shajuti Hossain**, Attorney for Public Housing Advocates: Agreed to narrow the baseline down to 2019 or 2050 households, and echoed comments around fair share. Specifically, noted a need for strong criteria to ensure jurisdictions get their fair share.
- **Avalon Schultz**: Expressed the City of San Leandro's support for 2050 Blueprint, with the understanding that it is still in draft form. Agreed that it is the most forward looking and equitable. Urged HMC to take the opportunity to have a bold vision. Since it seems unrealistic to shift jobs, noted that shifting housing makes sense.

Zoom Comments before break:

- **Riley**: Urbanized land area is using census tracts and definitions, they don't match up with jurisdictional limits, areas where urban services are available or planned, etc. If another definition for urbanized area is not used, it's not useful.
- **Levin**: Noah makes a good point – we've been assuming that "consistency" means having RHNA be shaped by PBA, but consistency could also be achieved by having PBA shaped by RHNA.
- **Al-Sharif**: We have heard that Item 5A 2 Appendix 5 in the Agenda packet is a little difficult to read as a PDF. We are planning to share an excel file of that table with you all after the meeting. Thank you for making that request Diane!
- **Aksel Olsen**: Jane Riley - to clarify, we used the urbanized area boundaries proper as well as jurisdiction boundaries. No tract geographies were used for the purpose of this calculation.

[Break]

HMC Discussion of Baseline Allocation

- **Shiple**: Noted a semblance of consensus on the baseline based on discussion. Opened a discussion before HMC moves to a decision point on baseline to recommend to staff.
- **Arreguin**: Preferred using 2050 households as the Blueprint baseline to ensure equitable distribution of units throughout the region. It is something the group wants to achieve, and it is a statutory requirement. Shared preliminary feedback received from the ABAG Executive Board where several board members supported incorporating Plan Bay Area 2050 into the methodology. Believed this decision would indicate to local partners and stakeholders that we are moving forward with a unified vision to bridge the gap between the development pattern we see today, and the future forward vision. Emphasized the potential for equitable RHNA distribution in the short term.
- **Eklund**: Agreed on using 2050 Household Blueprint. Why has household growth not been included in today's discussion?
 - **Adams**: It is not included because of feedback from last meeting. There was an interest in the Draft Blueprint playing a role in RHNA methodology, but concerns that using household growth would heavily push housing growth in South Bay. 2050 Households from the Draft Blueprint incorporates growth from the Draft Blueprint and current housing to find middle ground that HMC expressed a desire for.



- **Shiple**: Shared screen to show baseline options again. Summarized the comments so far and re-iterated what the consensus decision making process will look like. The group will move to a decision point on whether to keep or eliminate options one at a time. Confirmed everyone’s input will count, even if they are not on video.
- **Pierce**: Clarifying question about similar names of the options “2050 Households” and “Housing Growth” Blueprint options.
 - **Shiple**: Shared screen again so everyone could view the five options.
 - **Pierce**: Noted that many people in the chat seemed to agree that both of the Blueprint base options needed to remain in our conversation.
 - **Eklund**: Noted that they thought they had just asked this question, and received an answer that staff was simply responding to feedback. Noted that growth from the Blueprint was discussed but never voted on. Stated support for the Blueprint.
 - **Adams**: Clarified that household growth from the Blueprint was not used in the analyses for today’s packet, but this was not a suggestion that the option should be off the table entirely.
- **Shiple**: Noted that there appeared to be consensus around keeping Households 2019 or Future Year 2050 Households (Draft Blueprint) as baseline options and suggested opening consensus for one option at a time so everyone can weigh in on each option.
- **Levin**: Stated that there did not seem to be consensus around options four and five and therefore urged the group not to spend more time on them. Noted that there seemed to be a consensus around option one and three.
- **Shiple**: Proposed that the decision point process go one option at a time with opportunities for specific feedback. Reminded everyone that green means strongly support, yellow means some reservations, and red means strongly disagree or oppose. Eight people with a red card means the decision is blocked. Sixteen people with a yellow card means the decision is blocked. A decision means there are more green cards than yellow and red cards.

First decision point - should HMC recommend that ABAG staff use option 1 – 2019 Households as the baseline?

- **Shiple**: There are ten red cards, so the decision is blocked and the HMC is not recommending 2019 households as the baseline.

Next consensus point is the Future Housing Growth between 2015 and 2050 from the Draft Blueprint.

- **Shiple**: Should HMC recommend ABAG staff use this as the baseline? Re-iterated what each color vote means.
- **Filgor**: Is this option two or three?
- **Shiple**: Option two, we are going in order.
- **Shiple**: Noted seeing more than eight red votes, so the decision is blocked. The HMC is not recommending using Future Housing Growth as the baseline.

Next consensus point: Should HMC recommend option 3, using Future Year 2050 Households as the baseline for methodology?

- **Shiple**: Noted that there is consensus from the HMC that ABAG staff should use the Future Year 2050 Households from the Draft Blueprint as the baseline.



- **Shipleigh:** Is the group interested in a decision point on Urbanized Land Area and Existing Jobs? Mostly red votes for both. Congratulations on taking that constructive conversation and moving towards a decision point.
- **Adams:** Noted that since the group is recommending using the Blueprint as the baseline allocation, there may not be a need to incorporate an additional Blueprint factor. Do you want to continue considering the Draft Blueprint as an allocation factor?
 - **Shipleigh:** Stated seeing many people shaking their heads. Noted that the meeting set aside some time to discuss Plan Bay Area Blueprint factor but will skip it since it no longer seems necessary.
- **Brilliot:** Requested to put a motion on the floor to move forward with option 1B, the Bottom-Up – Three-Factor Concept with adjusted income groupings.
 - **Shipleigh:** Since the Plan Bay Area 2050 conversation is not necessary, moved on to discuss the income approach.
- **Shipleigh:** Noted we will start with clarifying questions since the material is complicated.
- **Shrivastava:** Urged HMC to decide if income shift can be taken off the table, and then have a conversation about the three-factor concept.
- **Selander:** Asked a clarifying question about the meaningful differences between income shift and bottom up approaches. Noticed that they seem to be fairly similar.
 - **Adams:** Clarified that the main difference is the approach for income distribution. The income shift is a mechanical approach to compare jurisdictions by regional income categories. Jurisdiction income allocations have already been set, so it might mean a wealthier jurisdiction gets more low-income units, and vice versa. The bottom-up approach allows more control over unit allocation by income. It allows for more fine-tuned control through weights and factors, although the numbers may look similar.
- **Eklund:** Clarifying question around 1A with Bottom-Up - 3-factor and 1B with adjusted income grouping. What is adjusted income grouping? What is the purpose?
 - **Adams:** It has to do with how moderate-income units are provided in the region. As we know, only a few places are actually able to provide moderate income units through market rate development. In most places, it usually involves some type of policy intervention. This idea was put forward by HMC members at the last meeting to think of moderate-income units as going to jurisdictions in the same way that low- and very low-income units are distributed. Noted that this does not impact how other income groups are allocated. From initial analysis, this method directs more moderate-income units to jurisdictions that tend to be wealthier and gives them a higher number of moderate income units, making their total allocation increase.
- **Alix Bockelman:** Given the complexity, can we have more discussion about this at the next meeting? Please confirm that staff is not hoping for a decision on this piece today.
 - **Adams:** Correct. We welcome questions and discussion but we are not asking the HMC to make decisions on this today
 - **Shipleigh:** Does that answer the question?
 - **Eklund:** Yes, I would like to see something written up about it. Noted feeling unsure how it would work and wanted more time to think on it.



- **Levin:** Followed up on Eklund’s question. Clarified that it will not get us to produce moderate income housing – we will have the same amount. It affects where that moderate-income housing would go. Since this agenda indicates informational, we should frame this as informational and not decision based. Mentioned the Brown Act and warned the group to be careful.
- **Walsh:** Representing Solano County as a subregion. Concerned about housing allocation in unincorporated Solano. Using Blueprint as a baseline almost doubles what Solano County’s allocation would be. Noted sensitivity around this issue because it may mean they would never get a certified housing element. Urged HMC to implement good planning practice and not include too many housing units in unincorporated areas. Highlighted that many of those areas do not have vital city services such as water, city infrastructure and sewage. Stressed that the community is rural, and this plan would strongly and negatively impact them.
 - **Brown:** Noted they are also in Solano County, and Benicia is in their district. Agreed with Walsh and wanted clarity around why there were so many units in unincorporated areas. Stated that there is no problem with growth, but pushing people out makes it hard to be near transit.
 - **Vautin:** Noted that commenters appeared to be referring to the options that were just tabled. It is more appropriate to refer to is the Baseline 2050 Households baseline. The Draft Blueprint provides an opportunity to check data and numbers, in this case, relating to concerns raised regarding unincorporated growth. The potential growth in unincorporated Solano is within the spheres of influence for Fairfield and Vacaville. Modelling and analysis are projecting some growth for those city limits to be expanded in the future. We will continue collaborating with our local partners. Noted that the Plan does not indicate growth outside of urban growth boundaries.
 - **Brown:** Urged staff not to assume Solano County will be able to handle that growth. Growing in the city sphere, as opposed to the city limit itself, means growth into areas without water, sewage, access to jobs and reliable transit.
 - **Vautin:** Noted Brown’s concerns and stated that the strategy for urban growth boundaries was approved by the Board in February 2020. However, they will have an opportunity to modify the strategy. Noted that staff will be seeking direction on it for the Final Blueprint as well.
- **Shipley:** Reminded the group that we should be focused on income allocation as structure for the methodology and ideally, come to a decision point.
- **Selander:** San Mateo County has huge disparity in income among communities. Noted that places like East Palo Alto and South San Francisco tend to have more lower-income households. With the Bottom-Up approach, above moderate RHNA allocations would go up in those places. However, the intention of the Bottom-Up approach was to avoid displacement. It seems like that is not what the numbers actually show?
 - **Adams:** Looking at the specific jurisdiction of East Palo Alto, it is challenging to know if it is implicit in the approach or something that is factored into it.
 - **Selander:** It seems counterintuitive to the approach. Cited an example from San Francisco. In lower income communities facing displacement pressure, it feels weird that above moderate housing is increasing. The same would go for the



inverse in higher income communities. Does it achieve what we are saying and hoping it achieves?

- **Macedo:** Referred to Eklund's question. Noted it felt important to document the intent of grouping the moderate-income units with the low- and very low-income. Encouraged the group to clearly outline what the goal would be. It may not change the zoning like how the lower-income would, but it may trigger SB35.
 - **Pappas:** Noted that there are a lot of great comments and concerns being raised. Responded specifically to Nell's concern. Using the Bottom-Up approach could result in many different things, which is why the factors and weights really matter. Encouraged the group to play around with the online tool. Noted that so many options and information have been presented. However, felt like many of the options are not working for many people. Stated that making a decision today for Income Shift or Bottom-Up would be very helpful for next time.
 - **Levin:** Clarified that the only thing changing with the modified Bottom-Up approach is how a fixed number of moderate-income units get divided among jurisdictions. SB 35 only pertains to production of above moderate-income units and very low- and low-income units. It does not take moderate-income production into account.
- **Shipleigh:** Asked if anyone would like to take on advocating for Bottom-Up or Income Shift approach to the group.
- **Levin:** Advocated for Bottom-Up approach because it emerged from problems encountered in previous RHNA cycles. The Income Shift approach allocates the total first, and then dictates what percentage should be low, very low and so on. For jurisdictions with low totals, it would not matter what percentage was low- or very low-income. The Bottom-Up approach asks where low- and very low-income units should go. There could be jurisdictions that got relatively higher amounts of both very low and above moderate depending on the factors. It would not be a tradeoff between one category and the other which gets to a more equitable distribution to affirmatively further fair housing and address racial equity. Strongly favored Bottom-Up approach.
- **Shipleigh:** Invited anyone else to speak on the Bottom-Up approach.
- **Brown:** Noted that the decision felt clear after hearing Levin.
- **Shrivastava:** Noted that the Bottom-Up approach meets all the metrics.
- **Shipleigh:** Invited anyone to speak on the Income Shift approach to help the group understand why it might be the preferred approach.
- **Clark:** Supported Bottom-Up approach because it is an equitable tool without consequences.
- **Shipleigh:** If nobody is speaking up on Income Shift approach, then we can move forward with a decision for income approach.

Zoom Comments before Public Comment

- **Riley:** Census definition of Urbanized Areas (UAs). "A UA is a continuously built-up area with a population of 50,000 or more. It comprises one or more places or central place(s) and the adjacent densely settled surrounding area urban fringes consisting of other places and nonplace territory."



- **Pierce:** Encouraging sprawl is not a goal of PBA2050. Urbanized areas as a base should be eliminated. That doesn't mean there might not be a factor of some kind for those cities over 50K.
- **Riley:** Agreed Julie
- **Regan:** We also have to remember that not all sprawl is created equal. If adding urbanized areas gives us additional opportunity sites to build within the Bay Area's boundaries, that means less leakage to the Central Valley and beyond and less VMT and GhG. Of course, we should try to build as much as possible in cities with transit alternatives, but those also happen to be the places where land is at a premium, the politics are harder and costs are highest.
- **Fierce:** I'm here, just not broadcasting my lunch into the public record.
- **Brilliot:** Make sure host turns our videos back on.
- **Brilliot:** It appears the host only turned off my camera and needs to turn it on. Or at least that is the message that I am getting.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Agree with Matt. There are infill development that can apply here. For example, in San Francisco Forest City's project in the Dogpatch and the Candlestick project had to build infrastructure but I wouldn't consider that sprawl.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Not sure how that shows up though in urbanized area definition.
- **Brilliot:** Thanks!
- **Pierce:** I was referring more to areas on the fringe of the Bay Area.
- **Riley:** The problem is that whatever we chose applies to all 101 jurisdictions. So choosing a baseline or factor to "fix" thinks in a particular jurisdiction may have adverse or unintended consequences in others. Big picture is needed.
- **Brown:** you have me blocked, Monica Brown.
- **Brown:** Thank you.
- **Jeff Levin:** Can we do a separate consensus check on 2050 growth?
- **James Pappas:** Yes, I agree with Jeff.
- **Al-Sharif:** Based on HMC feedback, we are capturing HMC member feedback visually using three cards. A green card shows you strongly agree or support the decision, a yellow card shows you have reservations but are not completely opposed to the decision, and a red card shows that you strongly disagree or oppose the decision.
- **Eklund:** RED 2019 HH
- **Fierce:** "Among the many baselines, should we use 2019"
- **Eklund:** GREEN -- Future Household growth
- **Eklund:** GREEN - Blueprint HH 2050
- **Eklund:** RED
- **Shrivastava:** Can we decide on Income shift vs Bottom up 3 factor now before we move to factors?
- **Shrivastava:** Agree
- **Kaplan:** Aarti, you are correct we will be discussing the income allocation approach before we discuss factors. We will likely discuss factors at the August 28th meeting.
- **Pappas:** I think the Plan Bay Area factor should be removed as it seems duplicative.
- **Pappas:** Agree with Aarti.
- **Shrivastava:** Bottom up tailors the factors to the income levels while the income shift uses one set of factors.



- **Levin:** Also, bottom up makes total units the result, while income shift uses total units as a starting point. Once the total is set, adjustments to income shares have less impact if the total is already small.
- **Pappas:** ADU's are also counted as moderate income units aren't they?
- **Littlehale:** To staff: I don't want to make a big data ask, but I am interested in knowing whether staff and other HMC members would find it helpful to have access to the ABAG jurisdictions' data from HCD's recently released RHNA Annual Progress Report summary tables - particularly the RHNAs for VLI+LI+Mod, prorated vs. VLI+LI+Mod permits. The 2019 progress reports allow us to evaluate progress on admittedly low-bar goals for 50% of the ABAG 5th cycle planning period.
- **Shrivastava:** Can we get to the motion?
- **Littlehale:** Link relevant to my comment two comments above:
https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/Annual_Progress_Report_Permit_Summary.xlsm
- **Vautin:** For Solano County comments, please refer to page 121 of 264 of today's packet.
- **Regan:** Thanks Scott! be great if they broke this data down by MPO.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Have to leave for another meeting, apologies. Unsure on the income allocations right now so not sure how I would vote. I am still a bit confused and will study these documents more and provide feedback to staff before next meeting. Thanks!
- **Nickens Jr.:** Agreed with James.
- **Riley:** Perfectly said James.
- **Nickens Jr.:** Agreed with Jeff.
- **Pappas:** Agree with Jeff.
- **Brilliot:** Great summary Jeff on the argument for Bottom up.
- **Romero:** Ditto, on agreeing with Jeff.
- **Pierce:** Should we actually vote cards on this decision for the record? just so we can show we really agree?
- **Brad Paul:** Nicely summarized Jeff.
- **Levin:** Julie - after we take Public Comment.

Public Comment on Income Approach

- **Aaron Eckhouse;** Regional Organizer with YIMBY: Supported Bottom-Up approach. Thought it is important to look at the total number of homes in each income level allocated to cities rather than looking at it as a percentage of the allocation. Concerned that many evaluation metrics that staff has presented measure success based off the share of a jurisdiction's allocation in different categories instead of the total numbers. Encouraged staff to adjust evaluation metrics that keep coming up around unincorporated areas such as Solano and Napa county. Both areas have relatively high jobs to housing ratio because, at least partially, they have a low denominator in terms of households. Encouraged the metrics to be on job proximity instead.
- **Castro:** Six comments were submitted and posted online

HMC Discussion of Income Approach



- **Shipley:** Opened the decision point. Should HMC recommend that ABAG staff use Bottom-Up income allocation approach in the methodology? Reminded everyone what the votes and colors meant.
- **Shipley:** Noted seeing mostly green. There is consensus that HMC should recommend staff use the Bottom-Up income allocation approach. Congratulations on making important decisions about the structure! Reminded HMC that none of the decisions are binding, but it will help the group move toward a recommended methodology. Stated that the group has two more meetings before a formal recommendation. Asked what HMC needs from ABAG staff to make the decision at that time.
- **Selander:** Can you share the screen so we can see the requests that have already been made?
- **Shipley:** Showed the [HMC Requests of ABAG Staff](#). Does this capture all the requests?
- **Walsh:** Following up on request for RHNA performance data. Can we get it by MPO by just Bay Area, rather than with every city in California?
 - **Adams:** Yes
- **Pappas:** Access to High Opportunity Areas stood out while playing with the online tool. Even though we are in a difficult and unclear period, jobs and fair housing will continue to be the two main issues. There are many ways to get at job access and expressed curiosity about combining High Opportunity Areas with the baseline. Noted that is one of the key factors that should be substantially weighted for all income groups to affirmatively further fair housing. Felt like this issue should be elevated more.
 - **Adams:** The Access to High Opportunity Areas factor is based on the Opportunity Mapping done by the State. Based on HMC comments at the last meeting that emphasized the importance of using that factor, we weighted that factor heavily when we paired it with the Blueprint growth allocation factor. Now that the HMC has selected the Households 2050 as the baseline, using the allocation factor from the Draft Blueprint is off the table.
 - **Pappas:** Proposed combining Access to High Opportunity Areas with the 2050 households as the baseline. Is there a way to elevate the equity issue with the three-factor concept?
 - **Adams:** Noted that staff has consistently heard the need to emphasize Access to High Opportunity Areas as a factor.
- **Shrivastava:** Wanted to see what factors went into the development of Plan Bay Area now that we are using it as a baseline. Understood that it is hard to quantify.
 - **Fligor:** Agreed that this information would be helpful.
 - **Vautin:** Happy to provide more information. Noted that the Blueprint details and technical resources are available on the website. Reminded HMC that it is not a factor-based process, it is about forecasting the influence of public policies.
 - **Shrivastava:** Understood, and still thought the information would be helpful. Particularly, if 2019 were the base, there would be a whole different discussion about weighting factors.
- **Selander:** Question on the “transit” toggle on the interactive tool. Does it refer to transit infrastructure or transit service? Many communities have big difference in the two.
 - **Adams:** Current transit factor is about proximity to transit facilities, using acres within Transit Priority Areas.



- **Olsen:** There are two in there that look indirectly at service, but ultimately, it is an area-based measure. There is another one about transit accessibility referring to how many jobs one can get to from transit.
- **Vautin:** Clarified that Transit Priority Areas are rail stations, ferry terminals, and 15-minute frequency bus routes which is where frequency comes into play in the geographic approach.
- **Selander:** Is there a better document for definitions of factors that should play a role in decision making?
- **Kaplan:** Noted that the descriptions in the tool are brief on purpose. Shared links to prior staff reports for more details.
- **Marti:** Found going through the visualization tool and providing feedback was useful to understand the different factors. Perhaps we can give ourselves homework again? Since we have a single baseline, it would be useful to go through that process or think collectively about it before next meeting. Ultimately, are we reaching the goals around affirmatively furthering fair housing and protecting at-risk communities?
 - **Shiple:** Great idea to spend some time preparing for the August 28 meeting.
- **Shrivastava:** Can we vote on if we should consider the adjusted income groupings? It might put one entire issue to bed.
 - **Adams:** Before we make a decision, can someone explain why they think shifting how moderate-income units are allocated is a good idea. There seemed to be confusion on it.
- **Marti:** Some moderate-income housing is produced through market rate mechanisms, but most is through affordable housing mechanisms. Drawing off SB 35, jurisdictions are being asked if they will meet RHNA goals on market-rate or above moderate housing separate from the other affordability categories. On the flipside, cities choose to invest in moderate, affordable and low-income housing now that we have expanded tax credits through the state that are specifically to address the moderate-income need.
 - **Shrivastava:** Asked if the non-adjusted income grouping would use a different set of factors to allocate housing.
 - **Adams:** The question is “does moderate seem more like very low- and low-income units or more like above moderate units?” Once we decide on that, we can decide what are the right factors for allocating market-rate units, and what are the right factors for allocating affordable units.
 - **Shrivastava:** Clarified that the main question for now is “Should moderate income units have the same set of toggles?”
 - **Adams:** Right. Should they have the same toggles as market-rate units, or as affordable units.
- **Brilliot:** Since this would not be up for a decision today, suggested coming back to it at the next meeting to give everyone time to think on it.
 - **Shrivastava:** Agreed and appreciated Gillian’s explanations.
- **Marti:** Reasoned that many people are concerned about high resource, high opportunity areas and fair housing. Affordability issues in these jurisdictions impact low- and moderate-income residents. High resource areas are often high rent areas too so affordable housing may not be accessible to moderate-income folks. With this affordability lens, it makes sense to lump moderate- and low-income together.



- **Forrest Ebbs:** Moderate housing plays a different role in different communities. In Antioch, it is hard to build moderate-income housing because it competes with market-rate. Noted that this is not the same for Oakland and Fremont. Urged against oversimplifying moderate-income housing because it plays different roles in different communities.
- **Selander:** Echoed the statement that moderate housing is particular to a jurisdiction. What percentage of jurisdictions in the nine counties have moderate-income prices within ten percent of market prices? If it is high, then it might be worth clumping them together. To decide, we have to know how many communities are impacted by having moderate prices too close to market rate prices.
- **Pappas:** No strong opinion on where moderate income goes. Jurisdictions will be particularly concerned that SB 35 has nothing to say about moderate. The group is essentially ignored by legislation. Noted pending legislation indicating that we treat moderate as above moderate.
- **Levin:** When cities file their annual progress report and provide information on how many moderate-income units they are producing, they indicate if units are deed restricted or just naturally occurring and priced at a level that is affordable to moderate-income households. This data may indicate places that are able to provide market-rate units through the market compared to places only able to hit moderate through deed restrictions.
- **Romero:** Expressed that the data point would be helpful. Specifically, in communities of color in large cities on the path of gentrification or already gentrified, moderate-income housing cannot be built without subsidy. In East Palo Alto, we are getting no moderate-income housing out of 1,050 units entitled or in the process of getting entitled.
- **Bonilla:** Noted that this is also accurate for San Mateo, where there is little moderate-income housing and the price is comparable to market-rate units. Believed there is a place for the moderate rates and should continue to keep the conversation going.
- **Shipley:** Noted that we are reaching end of today's discussion and refining list of requests. Next meeting on August 28 will need to make some big decisions. Encouraged HMC to take time to marinate on everything before then.

Zoom Comments During Discussion

- **Selander:** I sent a request to Alia to add to the HMC requests doc and it has not been added.
- **Eklund:** Green for Bottom up.
- **Semonian:** I'm green
- **Fierce:** Link to that document on the screen:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A8CmgpxBh7m_YoLEYPsJg_WpVNtduycbn6YDG_UupqAo/edit
- **Al-Sharif:** From Nell: Would you add to the HMC requests list the following: In Item 5a, Attachment 2, Appendix 2, when you remove a few rows in the third tranche labeled "Baseline Allocations," would you replace those rows with the following: 1) Current RHNA Allocation and 2) Current RHNA Performance (just total units permitted, no need to break down by income level)
- **Marti:** It seems we should explore giving 100% of high-resource factor (ie, only one factor) to affordable housing within the 2050 HH baseline.



- **Selander:** Totally agree with Aarti!
- **Kaplan:**
https://www.planbayarea.org/sites/default/files/pdfs_referenced/PBA2050_Draft_BPStrategies_071320_0.pdf
- **Kaplan:** This is a list of the PBA 2050 strategies, as Dave is noting.
- **Macedo:** I agree, given that direction, it will need to be clear to the public how it impacts the RHNA allocation.
- **Macedo:** Re: PBA
- **Riley:** Information on transit would be great, including capacity.
- **Pappas:** I agree with Fernando that at a majority of the low income housing allocation should be based on high opportunity- 60% at a minimum!
- **Kaplan:** This link has a definition of transit priority areas:
<http://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/transit-priority-areas-2017>
- **Pierce:** Please prominently post the link to the factors tool, so we can share it easily with colleagues - and find it ourselves!
- **Shrivastava:** Is there time to vote on whether we should use the Bottom up 3 factor or Bottom up 3 factor with adjusted income grouping?
- **Riley:** Agreed James - but can we have additional information about high opportunity areas, such as proximity of jobs and services? A high opportunity area that's an hour from services on a windy coastal road and without a sewer district is not suitable for high density housing
- **Brown:** Can we adjourn?
- **Kaplan:** Hi folks! As a reminder, here is a link to the tool landing page: <https://rhna-factors.mtcanalytics.org/>
- **Pierce:** thanks Eli!
- **Kaplan:** This is the income shift version of the tool: <https://rhna-factors.mtcanalytics.org/option1.html>
- **Kaplan:** This is the bottom-up version: <https://rhna-factors.mtcanalytics.org/option2.html>
- **Kaplan:** Both are accessed from the landing page.
- **Levin:** Agree. The issue around moderate-income housing is far more about affordable ownership. Most moderate-income renters are not overpaying, particularly when compared to low- and very low-income renters. But all this gets into what kind of zoning and policies cities put in their elements.

6. Adjournment/ Next Meeting

- **Arreguin:** No public comment. Thanked everyone for their time and participation. Meeting Adjourned 1:45 PM.
- The next special meeting of the ABAG Housing Methodology Committee is on August 28, 2020.

