



MEMO

To: RHNA HMC Team
From: Civic Edge Consulting
Date: July 17, 2020
RE: July 9, 2020 HMC Meeting #8 Notes



Meeting Info

Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) Meeting 8
Thursday, July 9, 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)

- This item was moved to the end of the meeting by the Chair

3. Chair's Report – Jesse Arreguín

- Expressed appreciation on behalf of the ABAG Board for the participants in this complex process.
- Clarified that we are limited by use of technology for participation and Q&A and that there will not be a formal break during the meeting.
- Written comments received will be on the record but will not be read aloud. Members of the public can speak during that portion on the agenda. Noted that the meeting will be webcast. Explained rules about how to digitally raise one's hand to speak.
- Stressed that due to the limited time today and the large number of commenters on non-agenda items, that portion of the agenda will be moved to the end of the meeting.
- Explained the updated consensus voting process so it is more visible to the audience.
- Victoria Fierce had requested a legislation update, which may be provided to HMC members at a future meeting.

4. Consent Calendar

- Minutes from last meeting approved from June 19, 2020.
- No verbal or written comments were received.

5. Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050 Draft Blueprint: Key Findings – *Dave Vautin (Information Item)*

HMC Members – Clarifying Questions

- **Bob Planthold:** Noted that the term “deed restriction” has other connotations. Asked what it refers to now in the context of PBA 2050.
 - **Dave Vautin:** Clarified that “deed restriction” applies to housing for folks at a specific income area, specifically lower income folks.
 - **Planthold:** Suggested using a different term, like “income restricted” for clarity.
- **James Pappas:** Noted that the projected growth for the South Bay is striking. Acknowledged that relaxing zoning controls could lead to a lot of growth in the South Bay in the model, but also felt this large projected growth has regional implications. Requested further explanation and a separation of housing and jobs.
 - **Vautin:** Noted that there is a lot more housing in PBA 2050 than in previous iterations, which was one of the reasons for improvements on our affordability trends. Similarly, most counties have more units than in previous iterations, but their share of overall growth might be smaller than previous iterations. Santa Clara County has a higher share and a higher total number of units. This growth in the South Bay is a result of applying different strategies, including adjusting zoning in specific priority areas to enable more development and re-development, streamlining growth in certain parcels, and re-developing aging malls and office parks, of which Santa Clara County has many.

Furthermore, in Santa Clara we see a lot of large parcels close to jobs, which makes the land incredibly desirable and valuable. The affordable housing being built is especially attractive for low-wage workers down in the South Bay. The growth pattern produced by our model stems from this desirability. Greater flexibility and development capacity would enable more growth since it is the largest cluster of jobs in the Bay Area.

Jobs are difficult to move due to the agglomeration effect, where jobs like to be near other jobs. We know there is a desire for telecommuting, and there may be more folks who don’t report to their worksite. However, there is a continued desirability to be close to other job sites. A lot of high-wage employers want to continue developing in the South Bay so the workforces can interact more when they do come to work. A strategy in the model was to put fee structures in place to encourage more jobs to move to housing rich areas that would be exempt from such fees, but the effect ultimately proved too small. Employers who wanted to develop in the South Bay simply paid the affordable housing fee and still increased their workforce down there. This narrative explains the robust job growth in South Bay region.
- **Neysa Fligor:** Noted that for job growth in South Bay, 41 percent feels way too high. Anecdotally, there has been job growth along San Mateo County going up to SF and Alameda counties and young tech employees want to live in those cities, which drives where the tech companies locate. Projection seems unrealistic based on what has been happening, and recent COVID factors. Further questioned the 14 percent work-from-



home projection. Concerned about making decisions based on this data that does not correspond with their lived reality. Lastly, RHNA and PBA have components for green space per capita and is curious how growth in South Bay will impact green space for PBA 2050?

- **Vautin:** Silicon Valley points well taken. Thanks for feedback – we need your feedback to modify our strategies across the region. To give a sense of why so much growth is happening in the South Bay rather than in a place like SF, SF growth is largely defined by pipeline projects in the City. Beyond that, there are a lot of small parcels that are unlikely to redevelop. Although there is a significant amount of growth in SF, it is limited. There is so much growth in South Bay because it has more capacity to grow and re-develop.
- **Pappas:** For jobs, or housing or both?
- **Vautin:** For both. There is limited additional up-zoning in SF, but a lot of San Francisco’s re-development is defined by big sites, including Hunters Point and Treasure Island, and specific locations in the Central SoMa Plan. We did not find that upzoning policies tested in the western half of SF did much to increase growth in that part of the city.

Going back to the original question about telecommuting - the state regulates the telecommuting assumption for PBA 2050. We have worked with them closely and, after COVID, we worked to increase it.

Regarding green space, we have a strategy designed to purchase more recreation and park space. There are many opportunities for urban parks as well in the Final Blueprint.

- **Fligor:** The tech sector should be engaged as stakeholders in this project.
- **Aarti Shrivastava:** Many communities in the South Bay will be looking at close to a 50 percent increase in units. A lot of that growth has to do with factors Dave mentioned and the desired results for the region. Suggests that jurisdictions need clarification around how quickly they are expected to grow.
Expressed concern that a lot of the growth in the South Bay will be in areas that are not well served by transit, hence the model’s lower performance for greenhouse gas emissions.
- **Elise Semonian:** Asked about the feasibility of running draft methodology through UrbanSim to evaluate greenhouse gas emissions.
 - **Vautin:** Unfortunately, that is not possible. Since the methodologies are an output element, we don’t have a good way to estimate a specific greenhouse forecast for each of the RHNA methodologies, but we can do so for the Plan Bay Area 2050.
- **Amber Shipley:** Reminded the group that we only have fifteen more minutes on this agenda item, and that it is for clarifying questions only. We will have discussion moving forward.
- **Michael Brilliot:** Can you clarify where in the South Bay the 41 percent job growth will go? San Jose is a bedroom community and has not seen that kind of job growth and our jobs to housing ratio continues degrading. It sounds like you are not projecting



that much growth for jobs in places like Redwood City, San Mateo and up the Peninsula, where job growth has occurred.

- **Vautin:** There is a confluence of economic strategies we applied in the model and, ultimately, our forecast shows high job growth in parts of San Jose, Santa Clara, and Mountain View. Those zones have dense development, many projects in the pipeline, and robust job growth. Referred to the website for the Blueprint materials with a breakdown of job growth in the different parts of Santa Clara County.
- **Jeff Levin:** First, how do the outcomes in the Blueprint compare to actual development in the last 8-10 years? Second, in the Blueprint, what percentage of total housing production is projected to be in the low- and very low-income category? Third, how does the new regional housing entity factor into those strategies?
 - **Vautin:** First, the housing growth pattern has been polarized in the past ten years. Approximately half of the region's growth has been in places like San Francisco and San Jose. The remaining growth has been in periphery region and edge suburbs. Bayside cities have contributed less, compared to their population. In the Draft Blueprint, there is lower growth in the three big cities, and more growth in Bayside suburban communities. The Draft Blueprint calls for about 400,000 new deed restricted units for low- and very low-income demographics – about 30 percent of all units. Third, we do not say who is generating the revenue to help pay for the new deed restricted affordable housing. It could be on the county, housing bonds, city level, regional, or a combination, but bonds will likely be needed to realize this question.
- **Julie Pierce:** What does it take to drive jobs to places where people already are? The inland communities that had the more affordable, naturally occurring housing like the East Bay, Northern Waterfront, and Solano County have wanted this for a while. We keep hearing "it will always be in the same place because jobs like to cluster." The VMT and greenhouse gas numbers are astronomical if we build more housing so far from jobs.
 - **Vautin:** Horizon analysis showed tax incentives were not strong enough to drive jobs to housing-rich places. In February, the Commission and the ABAG Board approved the study a fee structure, designed to charge impact fees for office development in job-rich areas. This has had only minimal impact on jobs moving to Southern and Central Alameda County, but not elsewhere in the region. The most aggressive strategy was to implement specific limitations in high job areas to grow jobs in other areas, which did move jobs to other counties in the model. However, this strategy was not moved forward into the Draft Blueprint by the Commission and ABAG Board.
- **Josh Abrams:** I want to offer feedback on this Blueprint, and you want the HMC to use Plan Bay Area 2050 in our work, but we have no way to discuss it. We can comment, but it feels like you do not value our input if you are not using this forum to get input.
 - **Vautin:** I am sorry that we do not have more time to talk about PBA 2050. We do value your input. I encourage you to participate in one of the many forums coming up for stakeholders and the general public. Reach out to our staff at info@planbayarea.com to learn more.



- **Tawny Macedo:** Is the housing growth model capped based on existing zoning? Cautioned that RHNA methodology may not limit consideration of housing sites based on existing land use restrictions. Also, are the 1.3 million new households in the housing growth pattern what Plan Bay Area sees being completed over the 30-year period? If so, how did that track for the last PBA where .8 million households were projected? Did we meet that housing goal last Plan Bay Area?
 - **Vautin:** First, we start with existing zoning, and then we apply strategies to enable growth in key growth areas, such as near BART stations. It goes beyond the existing zoning laws. It identifies areas that jurisdictions may consider peak growth areas in the future.
Second, our region has historically underproduced housing. We are not on track to hit our Plan Bay Area 2040 housing projections. However, Plan Bay Area 2050 has new housing strategies that are designed to enable a faster trajectory for housing growth, particularly in low- and very low-income levels where it is much needed.
- **Fernando Marti:** Bayside cities produced less housing growth than the three big cities that produce roughly half of the housing. Does that also include high opportunity/high resource cities? How well did high resource/high opportunity areas do in producing housing?
Second, in Plan Bay Area 2050 projections, maps emphasize growth around job centers like Silicon Valley. Does the Blueprint also look at differential allocations of affordable and market rate housing? If not, how do you align affordable versus market rate housing locations that RHNA process calls for?
 - **Vautin:** Many Bayside communities (not all) that have had lower housing production over the past decade tend to be the higher resource places that are concerned about new growth. The Draft Blueprint shows more growth in Bayside cities than we have seen in recent years, in part because we incorporated some high resource areas into the growth plan. There is more room for growth there, but we are making headway compared to the last plan which did not have much growth in high resource areas.
For breakdown by income, yes, we do simulation modelling at the different income levels. We have metrics in materials posted online that show where low-income households are in the Draft Blueprint. We are also doing some continued analysis on how the Blueprint does in terms of jobs-housing fit.
- **ShIPLEY:** Clarified that there are some hands raised by people who have already spoken, and new voices were prioritized first, per the norms adopted by the HMC last year.
- **Pappas:** Is the low projection of housing growth for Alameda, SF, and other traditionally transit-served areas associated with continued displacement in those communities?
 - **Vautin:** To clarify, there is not less housing projected in those areas – there is more than in previous PBAs – just a lower share of the total housing. It is very difficult to get to the causality of displacement metrics. We are exploring it further and have reported about areas of concerns. We want to improve the performance.



- **Pappas:** If you are projecting continued demand for market rate housing, which will displace lower-income people in those areas, and yet there is not a substantial amount of growth in housing – affordable and market rate – in those areas, then there is a disconnect of what people want to see in the model, and what the model predicts will happen?
- **Vautin:** We have an interest in providing a pathway to opportunity and have been trying to focus some of the affordable housing in high resource areas because it provides for upward economic mobility. But it is tricky because that necessitates market rate housing in lower-income areas which can drive displacement. We are continuing to work on it for the Final Blueprint.
- **Planthold:** Transit impacts where low-income people live. The Plan projects a certain amount of transit use, however COVID is resulting in the elimination of transit lines. Is there time to look at how the dramatic reduction in transit may impact where people will live?
 - **Vautin:** This is a very near- and immediate-term issue. There is not an immediate solution to the transit operators' deficits. The Final Blueprint will prioritize regional funding to get back to the 2019 service levels as soon as possible. We are trying to find ways to accelerate it sooner rather than later.
 - **Planthold:** Good to hear, thank you.

Zoom Comments Prior to Adams Presentation

- **Planthold:** "Deed-restricted?" Does that mean housing only for low-/ affordable income? Or, can that phrase include racially-biased covenants?
- **Abrams:** He meant that there is a deed restriction limiting rents. could be low or moderate/affordable rents/prices.
- **Fierce:** Yeah, we do a lot of terrible things still, but I'm pretty confident that we've completely ended racial covenants in terms of enforcement. Their legacy remains, of course.
- **Brown:** Solano County still needs cars.
- **Pappas:** Can you explain again why the South Bay receives such a large share of 2050 growth? How does it compare with current distribution of jobs and population and what drives the projected change in the future?
- **Planthold:** Folks, since Muni AND AC Transit are PERMANENTLY cutting MANY lines, does Plan 2050 have time and a way to modify its analyses & predictions before finalization? MUNI seems to plan [?HOPE?] for transit riders to shift to e-scooters, bikes, and e-bikes but shift back to cars. This mitigates against easy transportation options for seniors, people with disabilities and school-age youth. Can Plan 2050 call attention to the likely transit cutbacks and their effect on Plan 2050?
- **Semonian:** Is it possible to run our various draft RHNA methodology models through Urban Sim to find out how they fare for GHG reduction?
- **Riley:** Great suggestion Elise
- **Pappas:** Is the relatively lower distribution of housing growth in SF, Alameda, and other transit served counties be part of why low-income displacement continues in the forecast?



- **Macedo:** A couple of clarifying questions, for the housing growth assumptions, is the model capped based on existing zoning? I caution that the RHNA methodology may not limit consideration of housing sites based on land use restrictions. Also, are the 1.3M new households what the Bay area sees being completed over 30 years, eg. 43,000 a year or 346,000 over 8 years.
- **Marti:** Dave, you said half of production was in the big three cities, and relatively lower production in "Bayside" Cities. Would you say that it is also relatively lower production in high-source-high opportunity cities?
The RHNA process largely focuses on allocation of affordable housing and market-rate housing by geographies. The Blueprint maps show overall allocation of housing, do they also consider differentials of affordable and market-rate by different factors, as RHNA does, and if not, how will that align with RHNA?
- **Levin:** We can discuss this more in the discussion of relationship between PBA and RHNA, but what does it mean that PBA projects 30% of housing to be in the very low and low income categories, when RHNA requires planning for 40% in these two categories?
- **Strellis:** Hi Jeff - that's a great question. We are going to be covering that in agenda item 6.
- **Planthold:** It seems some who put something in chat box are being called upon before me, even before my queries were earlier. I did raise my hand. There seems a disjunction between asking a question in chat, raising a hand, and getting asked. I have been waiting longer to get my question asked. Might be a communications process needing fine-tuning. I have been waiting longer than others, but time is running out on this "clarifying questions" agenda item.

Public Comment on Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint: Key Findings

- **Noah Housh:** Completely agreed with Josh Abrams. Wanted to know Plan Bay Area impacts due to limitations in how it is presented and our capabilities to respond to the plan.
- **Alfred Twu:** We need to plan to succeed, not plan to continue this housing crisis. Urged to put more housing in the higher income areas and urged to aim for a higher number.

6. RHNA Methodology Concepts (*Information Item*)

- **Shipley:** Explained that Gillian will present, and then do clarifying questions. Then, we will do the next presentation, and questions for both together since they relate.
- Presentation by Gillian Adams.

Zoom Comments Before Public Comments

- **Planthold:** ?Garbled? Re-link?
- **Levin:** Gillian's audio is breaking up. Can you repeat please
- **Fierce:** yeah, your upload bandwidth is trashed right now sorry
- **Levin:** I think she lost her connection
- **Planthold:** Any alternate presenters/ speakers from ...?
- **Fierce:** anyone know a good shanty wb Gillian
- **Planthold:** Cut-outs reminiscent of what was planned for in event of nuclear holocaust.



- **Marti:** Why does Solano County show up so high in the Blueprint baseline?
- **Riley:** And unincorporated Solano at that . . .
- **Walsh:** Option 1: Solano County unincorporated booming! Almost the entire county is on septic and well. Must be a mistake.
- **Brown:** To add to Matt: We like to grow food and flowers.
- **Riley:** Yeah that's not OK.
- **Fligor:** When do we vote on whether we want to use Plan Bay Area 2050 for RHNA?
- **Fierce:** does the Blueprint option use growth by jurisdiction as the baseline, or population share in 2030 as the baseline?
- **Strellis:** Hi Neysa - that's a great question. We will be discussing whether the committee wants to use PBA 2050 for RHNA and exploring if there is consensus around that point as part of agenda item 6B.

Public Comment

- **Aaron Eckhouse, Regional Organizing Director with California YIMBY:** Concerns that using PBA baselines might conflict with the direction this committee has already been going. Particularly along the Peninsula and SF – areas that offer high access to opportunity and excellent jobs proximity but would see greatly reduced housing growth under PBA. Expressed concern about a disconnect between growth and transit service and stressed consideration of additional housing in San Francisco and Berkeley.
- **Shajuti Hossain, Public Advocates and 6 Wins for Social Equity Network:** Urged the committee to strengthen their commitment to equity and continue to center the role race plays in all of our systems, including housing. Emphasized the impacts on our Black and brown neighbors, co-workers, and family. Asked for the HMC to have more discussion on the proposed evaluation criteria and come to an official decision on whether they are the right criteria or need to be adjusted. Noted that 6 Wins is opposed to the PBA Blueprint being used as a factor or the baseline in the methodology because it fails to spread out the RHNA across the region. Expressed strong preference for the bottom up approach because the income shift would severely increase displacement risk in too many vulnerable communities and cities. Suggested grouping income categories according to SB 35 for the bottom-up approach, with above moderate income in a separate group and the remaining three categories in another group. The lower and moderate income housing rely on public subsidies. Lastly, stated strong preference to use household totals from 2019, as the Plan Bay Area baseline would leave out too many high opportunity area jurisdictions.
- **Auros Harman:** Spent entire adult life all over the Bay Area. Current resident of San Bruno and serves on the Planning Commission there. Echoed statements about the Plan projecting too little housing growth in high opportunity areas. Stressed the need to be much bolder to address systematic inequities that we have created intentionally through public policy through the 20th Century and emphasize building enough housing to reduce the market rate down and broaden housing accessibility for median income folks. Urged staff to put our overall housing between 800,000 to 1 million in the next cycle and allocate them where people already work.
- **Robert Fruchtmann:** Calling from SF. Urged the committee to allocate more housing to SF rather than the approach taken in the bottom-up concept. Noted that in the last decade, SF has added 200,000 jobs, and added 25,000 units of housing and stressed the



need to fix that disparity to stem the massive displacement of people from SF. The National Community Reinvestment Coalition identified eastern neighborhoods in SF as the fastest gentrifying in the country. In the same area, they expressed dismay that Oakland is also gentrifying from SF's job growth.

- **Steven Buss, YIMBY action:** SF resident. Agreed with Aaron, Robert, and Commissioner Harmon. We need to seek outcomes that significantly grow the housing stock in high opportunity, high density areas to minimize car travel. Put housing along existing transit lines in existing cities. Warned that SF population will be at 5 million people by 2050 but our current plans to not plan for that. Strongly urged to not push people out to outliers. Expressed huge concern that the highest growth was in outlier communities because it will push people into 2-3-hour commutes to Silicon Valley. We really need to build the growth where people want to live and where excellent jobs are so that people don't have to waste their lives sitting in their cars. Encouraged the path that reaches the highest growth in these areas.
- **Ira Kaplan:** Lives in SF. Noted that the housing shortage is most severe in areas with the highest housing prices. Areas like SF, Peninsula, South Bay near Stanford University are where the housing should go because that is where we see the housing shortage. These are also high resource areas. Emphasized putting housing in areas with access to jobs and high resources. Many schools in these areas suffer from under-population. There are not enough students because families got priced out. Adding housing would help sustain those excellent schools, which would be a shame to lose if there is not enough housing to provide enough students. For all of those reasons, there should be more housing in SF, the Peninsula, and northwest Santa Clara County.
- **Jesse Arreguin:** Noted that there are more speakers than what originally appeared, and the new time limit is one minute per commenter.
- **Sonja K Trauss:** Supported housing in high opportunity areas. Felt it was hard to tell which plan allowed for that and wanted clear information. It is tempting to load up the Peninsula because Cupertino and Palo Alto are so famous for having such a need for housing- such large lot sizes, such low density zoning. But other places are under RHNA'ed, like places in the East Bay. Where are the places with large lot sizes, single family homes, and that are extremely expensive? Being expensive is a way for people to tell that it is a desirable place.
- **Sarah Ogelby, YIMBY Action:** Living in SF. Mr. Vautin said that SF's ability to produce housing was defined by projects in the pipeline, and that small parcels were unlikely to be re-developed. California has been crafting laws to break down segregation in SF, but SF still refuses to take decisive action. In the name of Black Lives Matter and all the calls for social justice happening on its streets, please stop pretending that SF's wealthy neighborhoods get off the hook another decade. Please allocate heavy portions of units there, beginning with Forest Hill. And please do not make my remote-working husband and others like him feel like they have to sacrifice a fair-weather, health conscious walkable region for career success.
- **Darrell Owens, East Bay For Everyone:** Strongly opposed the small size of the housing projection in SF, noting that we do not need more super mega development housing projects out in the suburbs of Santa Clara County. We need dense infill projects in the urban core where most people and jobs are. It is ridiculous to project a growth rate



higher for Oakland than for SF, when Oakland has nothing going on and SF has major office projects coming down. That is insane!

- **Marcus Helmer:** Lifelong Napa County resident where wealth and opportunity abound. Noted it is no secret why our poverty rate is so remarkably high - housing. Referred to other comments, and mentioned that In Napa, we are planning for more jobs than housing. We are not building enough housing where there are jobs and resources. And it is having far reaching and disastrous consequences. Address that please. Thank you.
- **Lucia Sanchez:** Requested that ABAG commissioners allocate more housing to high opportunity areas. My family lives in Solano because it is the only county they can afford, but most of them work outside Solano. So right now, you are in the position where you are able to help families like mine. The impact of building so little high-opportunity housing worries me because you are letting the community know that you are okay with status quo. Urged again to allocate more housing to high opportunity areas like Solano County.
- **Jordan Grimes, Peninsula for Everyone:** Lifelong resident of San Mateo County, called it "pitiful" to add such a small amount of housing in such wealthy areas like San Mateo County, the Peninsula and SF since we spent years not building enough housing there.
- **Fred Castro:** That was the last public comment. One was received by email which is available in the email packet sent out earlier, and online.

6b. RHNA Income Allocation: Further Discussion of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Income Allocation Methodology

- Presentation from Eli Kaplan
- Afterwards, people can decide which allocation they prefer
- **Shipleigh:** Re-iterated what is coming up, and what the questions should focus on

Clarifying Questions from Eli and Gillian's Presentations

- **Levin:** What guidance do we have from HCD about what it means to be consistent between RHNA and Plan Bay Area? What is the threshold we have to pass? Expressed great discomfort with implementing Blueprint in any way and asked about other ways to demonstrate consistency. Also concerned that Blueprint calls for 30% very low- and low-income housing while the RHND requires us to plan for 40%, so there is already a disjuncture between the Blueprint and RHNA. Can staff comment on implications of that?
 - **Vautin:** Historically, when ABAG evaluates consistency, it is based on the jurisdiction totals, and not based on any income level data. So that issue might be a moot point because the statistics are of a different type. When we talk about low-income in the Plan, we have broken the region into quantiles for income categories. Those brackets are different than ones used by HCD, so the 30% low-income in the plan versus 40% in RHNA involves comparing different thresholds. Comparing them is like comparing "apples to oranges."
- **Marti:** Asked why Solano County shows such a high rate of growth in this model.
 - **Vautin:** Solano County's unincorporated population is the smallest of all the counties. Noted that the actual number of units is relatively small but because the growth is expressed as a percentage it appears high.



- **Brown:** Expressed frustration at the lack of clarity around the numbers and the lack of time to digest them. Noted she is not ready to make a decision as a result of this lack of clarity.
- **Fierce:** Question about the two options. Does the Blueprint option use growth by jurisdiction as the baseline value, or is it population share in 2030?
 - **Adams:** It is based on household growth.
- **Eklund:** Expressed confusion about option 1 and 2 [referring to page 106 of the packet]. Asked if option one included the last three items on each individual chart, and if option two included the first three.
 - **Kaplan:** The meeting packet contains a series of charts that show the number allocation to each jurisdiction under these different scenarios. It does not include percentage of growth, which we can include in the future. In the chart, the first bar is not a methodology we are considering. Explained the household baseline allocation, the housing jobs crescent methodology under different baselines, and the Blueprint allocation with no additional factors. The last methodologies apply the Blueprint baseline to other methods we are discussing.
 - **Eklund:** So the Blueprint allocation is option 1?
 - **Kaplan:** Correct
 - **Eklund:** The other bars are option 2?
 - **Kaplan:** Correct
 - **Eklund:** Requested clarification of the Housing-Jobs Crescent?
 - **Kaplan:** It is one of the methodologies created by HMC in March. There were three that got the most votes from the HMC and that group chose the name.
 - **Eklund:** Okay. We are spending thousands on this whole 2050 Plan Bay Area Draft Blueprint and eventually Final Blueprint to incorporate. We are spending so much time and effort to study it, why wouldn't we use it instead of just using 2019 households? It would be more updated and achieving more of the goals. If we do not use Blueprint, we should not make it, or change it into something usable.
 - **Shipley:** That is for HMC to hash out together. Staff has presented pros and cons of various perspectives. It is a decision point you will arrive at and make a recommendation to ABAG staff. Hopefully hearing from each other will help that.
- **Pappas:** The reason we may not use the Plan Bay Area Draft Blueprint is because we may want to respond to the current conditions people are living in. We used 2019 household distribution in our exercise. The maps interact differently with different factors considered. When I played with the map tool, the colors were indicative of change but did not provide the whole picture. Can we get a version of the tool that has the numbers so we can understand what it means to use Plan Bay Area as a baseline?
 - **Kaplan:** We hope to be able to build different baseline options in the tool before August meeting.
- **Walsh:** Solano County does not have the population of other Bay Area counties, but our growth rate is still over 20 percent in the Blueprint. This seems to indicate a mistake in assumption. Unincorporated Solano County has no city services, no PDAs, no transit



centers, no city centers, and no job centers. Expressed strong dissatisfaction with the Blueprint. It does not feel “reasonably accurate.”

- **Vautin:** All jurisdictions had opportunity to check data in 2019 through the BASIS initiative. That being said, we also apply strategies on top of that baseline data, so we will go back and look. But again, there are a very small number of housing units projected in the county. It is appearing to be a significant growth because there are so few units to begin with in the unincorporated areas.
- **Shrivastava:** How did you scale the Blueprint allocation? Did you take the number from the 35-year period and scale it down to RHNA period?
 - **Aksel Olsen:** Blueprint growth is about 1.28 mill. We take the growth pattern and make it fit the scale.
- **Ranelletti:** Are you looking for feedback today for baseline in general, or just where the Blueprint should be used as baseline? I am trying to figure out if the Blueprint will be used. I have feedback I would like to give for other options. Is that today or a future meeting?
 - **Shipley:** Ideally today, but we are time crunched and only have 15 minutes. But that is a conversation you need to have and a decision you need to make. If you are using the Blueprint in any capacity, they have provided a few different ways to use it.
- **Levin:** Repeated request for data tables, particularly for Appendix 6b. Noted the data was difficult to digest and requested additional time.
- **Ellen Clark:** Requested clarification of the meaning of “baseline” in both scenarios?
 - **Adams:** The baseline is a way to assign each jurisdiction a starting point from which additional factors might apply. We are presenting two different ways to assign the initial share. One is based on 2019 households, and the other is based on share of future growth forecasted in Plan Bay Area. The baseline is the starting place, and if we use other factors, they adjust the baseline accordingly.
- **Brilliot:** Can you explain how the indicator with the divergence index worked? It was the one at the end where the housing crescent did the best.
 - **Kaplan:** That metric was informed by conversations with stakeholders about how in the past there were jurisdictions whose share of the region’s RHNA was far lower than their share of the region’s households, and there were concerns that these jurisdictions tended to be those exhibiting more racial and economic exclusion. This metric tries to measure that by looking at jurisdictions that are above average in divergence score, with the most different racial demographics from the region, and also above average in their share of households above 120% of the Area Median Income. About 31 jurisdictions fit this description. This metric checks whether the RHNA allocations to those 31 jurisdictions are at least proportional to those jurisdictions’ share of the region’s households. Essentially, if one of those jurisdictions is 1 percent of the region’s households, we wanted to check whether they receive at least 1 percent of the region’s RHNA. There are some limitations and potential flaws to the metric, because it does not take into account relative jurisdiction sizes or how close to a “fair share” a jurisdiction got if it receives less than a proportional allocation.



- **Fierce:** Question about the evaluation metrics in Objective 5 stating that jurisdictions with a high percentage of households are living in high resource tracts. Suggested shifting the focus from what percentage of people live in a high resource area to what percentage of land is in high resource areas. Because it is possible that 1 percent of people in a neighborhood hold 90 percent of the land, and then everyone else gets less affordable housing because of that.
 - **Kaplan:** HCD consistently looks at percentage of people in those tracts. We can find a way to incorporate Victoria's suggestion too, but we were trying to address how RHNA methodology will be evaluated by the state.
- **Fligor:** How do we interpret the word "consistent?" The two options presented today, I am not in favor of either but I want to make sure we are consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050. Are there other ways for us to be consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050?
 - **Adams:** The statute says that RHNA needs to be consistent with PBA 2050. Any other insights from Tawny at HCD?
 - **Macedo:** You're right, looking at the consistency from both plans is left fairly wide open. I can bring more context for more clarity.
- **Levin:** Are we only voting on option one or option two even though we are looking at a whole set of scenarios in the packages? Is 2019 households still an option for RHNA? Or we must choose between Blueprint as distribution and Blueprint as baseline.
 - **Adams:** We have provided two different ways to use the plan. One is direct allocation, and one is changing the baseline. Option 3 is not using the plan, and continuing to use 2019 as baseline, or discussing other baselines if the group is interested.
- **Levin:** Thanks, that greatly clarifies what is on the table.
 - **Vautin:** To add, the Blueprint is just a resource for you to consider. It may be the easiest way to make sure RHNA and the Plan Bay Area 2050 are consistent, but it is not required. If the HMC chooses not to use the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint in the RHNA methodology, you just need to make sure the factors and weights you choose lead to a RHNA allocation that is consistent with the Blueprint. It may be trickier, but it may get you the desired results.
- **Marti:** Many of us are grappling with a decision between Plan Bay Area Blueprint baseline and 2019 households baseline. Is it possible to add in some of the factors that went into the Blueprint to the online RHNA visualization tool? There are certain things within the Blueprint that look good, but maybe people are uncomfortable with using the Blueprint as the baseline. But if it was possible to add some of those Blueprint factors to the tool, it might be good and the HMC could play with adding these into the methodology.
 - **Vautin:** The answer to that question comes down to how fundamentally different the RHNA process and the Plan Bay Area process are. RHNA is a math exercise and the Plan is more about using strategies as ingredients you put together. Is it possible to identify a data set and factor that aligns with each of the public policy ideas we explore in Plan Bay Area? Maybe, but it would be very complicated. There are 25 strategies at play that were approved by the MTC and ABAG boards, and some may not have a good mathematical factor ready to be used in the



RHNA methodology. It is not a clear cut yes or no, and it would be very complicated at this late stage of the HMC process.

- **Marti:** Are we constrained by mathematical questions? Could the HMC decide to consider development in specific locations like the 680 Corridor and allocate housing based on that rather than using a mathematical formula? Is that off the table as far as statute is concerned or can we add in strategic planning questions?
 - **Vautin:** Defer to Gillian. There is no region in California that has gone that route. Usually the approaches are very mathematical and focused on factors and weights related to the characteristics for each jurisdiction.
 - **Adams:** I have not seen anything like that. It is important to keep in mind the narrative. How would those places be chosen? There is value for the local governments that have to implement RHNA to have a sense that there is a formula in which they were all treated the same. We can use the Plan, which relies on local land use information, but we cannot limit RHNA based on local land use decisions. Your suggestion adds a level of complexity to the project that may not necessarily be helpful. But when you think about places where you want growth to go, what leads you to think of that place? Can we use that as a factor that gets applied to all similar places?
- **Shiple:** Urged HMC members to look again at the discussion questions and slides. What we need to hear from you, now or via email is what information you need to make a decision in August? What information do staff need to prepare for that discussion to move towards decision points and consensus as a committee?
- **Arreguin:** Would the committee be comfortable extending by 15 minutes to continue today?
 - **Various Participants:** Agreed to extend
 - **Shiple:** Noted there would not be any voting. Extra time will be used for discussion with a focus on the type of information HMC members are looking for from staff: maps, data tables, etc. What is still in your mind as you make decisions?
 - **Planthold:** Some people want to talk and work it out all at once and others do not. Some of us have already left the meeting. It is unfair to suddenly decide to extend the meeting. We should pick it up next time so people do not feel left out of the decision making process.
 - **Shiple:** Clarified that no decisions being made. Today, we only want to hear what you need. You can also communicate by chat or email to rhna@thecivicedge.com
- **Pappas:** Requested that the meeting's material be broken down into more manageable pieces and clearly identify the upcoming action items. Plan Bay Area and 2019 households are suggested as a baseline, so that is a clear question for us to take action on. People are raising some valid points on overall land area, there could be additional factors, and there is the income allocation approach we use to apply factors to the baseline. Can you help us narrow the field and move us toward action items that we can vote on and move forward?
- **Levin:** Reiterated the need to have the data tables to further clarify the housing projections. Noted a desire to see what happens in the bottom-up approach from merging moderate-, low- and very low-income housing together like in SB 35. It will



have tremendous implications for displacement-inducing development. What does all of this mean for equity and affirmatively furthering fair housing? Encouraged HMC to remember that the reason for RHNA and Housing Element Law is promoting racial and economic equity. Noted he is leaning towards using bottom-up approach on 2019 household baseline because it produces a more equitable and even distribution across the region. RHNA only dictates zoning so it determines where housing CAN be built, not that it necessarily will be built. In the last RHNA, we thought we were promoting smart growth, but the market would not build where we said it should and could not build where it wanted to. Warned the group against polarized distribution in RHNA. All jurisdictions should be doing something closer to their fair share in a way that allows the region to actually accommodate its need.

- **Shiple:** Reminder that this is a time for you to ask for information to make a decision.
- **Ranelletti:** First, I do not support using the Draft Blueprint as a baseline or an allocation. I have a sense that the committee for the most part agrees with that. I think we can have some sort of temperature check on that, through the red/yellow/green exercise and just get that off the table. Second, for August, I would like to see compared baseline 2019 households to jurisdiction land area. I think land area is the only fair common ground starting place. If we are basing it on households, that is incorporating our past inequities.
- **Marti:** Echoed what Jeff said earlier on importance of looking at the bottom-up approach by separating out above-moderate units from all the other income categories. There has been lots of feedback as people play with the toggles. I think there is consensus around exploring baselines that aren't Plan Bay Area. Maybe helping us think through the benefits of the different weights and factors? I simplified it to one factor for above-moderate units, and one factor for lower-income units. There is a lot of logic to using land area, and there is a particular logic, especially as we talk about big numbers, to thinking about the large sites and underutilized parcels in jurisdictions. Can underutilized sites (parking lots, one-story buildings) be integrated as a factor? How could we integrate these opportunities for development with the other factors we've been talking about so far?
- **Abrams:** There are options out there that we are not exploring. The tool encourages us to fit our thinking into a box. Strongly urged more creativity in thinking. I would like to see an expectation that cities with a jobs-housing gap work to significantly reduce it. I do not think we should be forcing low-income communities to grow if they do not want to. How do we discuss cities that have artificially kept their population low? None of these are possible conversations within the tool so maybe we can move beyond the tool.
- **Eklund:** Some people mentioned land area and it is important to look at buildable land area. Mentioned they were the minority vote for not including land with a large fire risk. Given what has been happening with PG&E, we can't build in those areas. I am leaning towards bottom-up approach for the Blueprint baseline. For any of these options, it is important for us to understand what it will mean for each particular jurisdiction. Some implications would absolutely set jurisdictions up to fail, and ABAG should not be any part of that. I need more information on what the implications mean. There should be no questions in mind about what each option means. Expressed confusion regarding jobs-housing crescent and does not recall voting on it. What does it include and what does it mean for each jurisdiction? What is the best person to email?



- **Shipleigh:** rhna@thecivicedge.com. We will combine all the emails.
- **Eklund:** Will that be sent out? Not everyone is on chat. I will need more time to talk to colleagues and staff.
- **Shipleigh:** Yes, and it is also in the chat.
- **Semonian:** I asked Eli if we had a way to use Plan Bay Area in the tools. It would be helpful so we can see how it can play out as a methodology or the baseline.
- **Shipleigh:** Great. I want to acknowledge that these are very complicated issues and confusion is understandable, as is the need for more time to digest. Noted the HMC will be reaching a decision point next month. Urged everyone to think about the discussion questions on page 19 for the August meeting.

Public Comment on 6B: Further Discussion on the RHNA Methodology

- **Aaron Eckhouse, California YIMBY:** Raised concern about evaluation metrics that use the percentage of allocation within the jurisdiction rather than total quantity. Acknowledged that this issue has been brought up before. Expressed concern similar to what we are seeing with Solano County – a large space, but a low number that misleadingly suggests there have been an appropriate allocation of affordable housing. It is more important to have higher quantities than higher percentages.
- **Steven Buss, California YIMBY:** Expressed confusion about metrics. It was presented as a tradeoff between lots of affordable housing or lots of market rate housing. High cost areas need both market rate and subsidized housing. We also need to provide opportunity for people who cannot afford market rate. Please plan for a lot of both types of housing in high cost areas. I disagree with the colors. Green should represent high growth, not red.
- **Noah Housh, Alternate for HMC from Cotati:** This was a difficult meeting for me. There has been a consistent pushback against using the Blueprint and a lot of our time on if we should use it. Desire to get the Blueprint off the table and move on. Hoped for next meeting to have more time for committee discussion and less time for staff “sales pitch.” Echoed comments from James, Neysa and Jeff’s comments. Stated that using existing household data used as a baseline is critical because it highlights the existing problems we are trying to solve for with these allocations. The Blueprint is a thirty-year growth model whereas RHNA is based on 8-year allocation cycle. The housing/jobs crescent was one of the top choices of the HMC. I support bottom-up approach or the housing/jobs crescent approach with the 2019 baseline.
- **Robert Fruchtman:** Calling from SF. I was originally confused as to which baseline to use. I made up my mind for 2019 household baseline because it is clear we get more housing. If we use bottom up approach and income shift data, SF would receive 85,000 new homes in next cycle. Compared to our past cycle and our jobs-housing numbers. It is not great, but it is the best of the bad options I think we have.
- **Anna Driscoll, Enterprise Community Partners:** Reaffirmed bottom-up approach with 2019 baseline. Now more than ever, we must acknowledge and directly counteract the harms of racist planning and policy that continue to impact the Bay Area housing system. We need to deliver on our statutory objectives and reduce housing disparities and how they continue to widen across racial lines. Since RHNA and PBA function on two different



timelines and scale, we support bottom-up approach rather than income shift approach. It best allows us to promote accessibility and prevent displacement.

- **Sidharth Kapur:** Echoed Anna's points. We have to affirmatively further fair housing as an SB 828 requirement. The Blueprint makes a lot of assumptions about what cities will want to up-zone. The baseline is not neutral and would hurt fair housing. It is based on status quo. It may be a violation.
- **Sam Deutsch:** SF resident. Echoed support for using the 2019 housing baseline. Mentioned climate – focusing on coastal development rather than further inland, allows people to live in a temperate climate and therefore rely less on heating and gas. It would promote sustainability and further our carbon reduction goals. Given how affluent the Bay Area is, the RHNA numbers should be much larger.
- **Kyle Kelley:** Lives in Santa Cruz, works in Los Gatos. Los Gatos is a high resource area that needs to have affordable housing alongside market rate housing, especially as big tech companies like Netflix, Barracuda, etc. continue building. Many people who come to work (baristas, grocery store workers, etc.) all come from Central Coast and Seaside area. coast and commute far because there is not enough housing. I do not want AMBAG to do more because ABAG did not aim high enough for affordable housing.
- **Arreguin:** No public comment submitted; agenda item completed.

Zoom Comments:

- **Pappas:** Will we have the opportunity to re-do the income shift and bottom up exercises using Plan Bay Area as a base line? Or see more analysis from staff? It would change the calculus for us as we consider if or how to incorporate Plan Bay Area as well as the various factors. The exercise we did used 2019 household distribution rather than plan Bay Area
- **Brown:** Schools are "good" because of money. Many teachers spend a lot of their own money to help students. Very not happy with that one persons comments.
- **Nickens:** I would like to push back on the public commenter that said that "Oakland has nothing." This is extremely problematic. Oakland is a beautiful, diverse, thriving city that is home to countless working class Black and Brown communities and other communities of color that form the backbone of our economy as our essential workers. Moreover, Oakland is a legacy city that has fought for generations to ensure that the Bay Area and the nation lives up to its promise, especially as it relates to civil and human rights for Black Americans. We must be very careful with our language and especially how we talk about communities that experienced historic state sanctioned disinvestment.
- **Fierce:** a point of information: Darrell is Black and *from* Oakland.
- **Fierce:** reposting this point of information since I didn't sent to "Everyone": Darrell is Black and *from* Oakland.
- **Brown:** So, does the blue print 2050 create more housing in the red portion of Solano, which has no water and infrastructure?
- **Pappas:** could staff share the numeric results of the combination of the factor methodologies with Plan Bay Area 2050 as a baseline similar to the outputs we were able to produce when using the tool?
- **Clark:** Yes, it's hard to undertand details from the tiny tiny maps



- **Walsh:** Yes Monica. And its based on some assumption that .uninc. Solano should expect a 22%+ growth rate. With no PDAs, transit centers, job centers, or public utilities, I have no idea where this came from.
- **Shrivastava:** For the Blueprint baseline number, is that for the 35-year period or is it adjusted to reflect the 2023-2031 RHNA period?
- **Brown:** I am not able to make a comment until I can go over all this material. Solano county makes no sense why? when there is no growth outside city limits.
- **Zipper Thomas (Privately):** Jess do we have another meeting after this one?
- **Olsen:** 2019 hh in unincorporated Solano is around 6,800
- **Gentry:** In Attachment A to Item 6a what does "scaled to RHND" mean for the Blueprint allocation? Also, how is the 2019 household baseline being utilized for distributing the allocation?
- **Levin:** I agree with James' request - it would be very useful to have the data tables that sit behind the small graphs and maps.
- **Fierce:** I believe these bars are in the fourth attachment, "Item 6a 4 Attachment A"
- **Levin:** Why are we being presented today with only two options - using Blueprint as the distribution vs Blueprint as baseline? Everything we've been presented also shows various options using 2019 Households. Is that option 3?
- **Brilliot:** See agenda Item 6a 4 Appendix 2 to see how growth would differ by jurisdiction by methodology
- **Brilliot:** We are only allowed at this point to ask clarification questions and not make comments or provide feedback correct?
- **Levin:** Strongly agree with James comment/request.
- **Levin:** Not just the tool - can we get tables of numbers.
- **Strellis:** Hi Michael - yes this is still clarifying questions. Thank you for asking
- **Abrams:** Can we get the PBA projected number of jobs by jurisdiction and plan bay area population projection by jurisdiction?
- **Riley:** Thank you for your presentation Eli. I am scared by what I see for unincorporated Solano. How can this be consistent with what the HMC has discussed to date? How do we achieve consistency with PBA when it is a plan for 3 decades and RHNA is for less than 1 decade? The economic projections made over a 30 year period may play out, but NOT in the next 8 years - we will have at least half of this RHNA period in economic recovery from the pandemic. If the methodologies that we've discussed so far provide the needed consistency with PBA, then let's move on. We don't have 30 more years to move toward social equity.
- **Fierce:** I think we're all having a hard time understanding the visualizations. looking at the actual numbers in the attachment, Solano looks pretty fine, but the red can be startling because its relative to a smaller number
- **Riley:** That's a good point. The tables in the Appendix are much more clear
- **Fierce:** I've got another question here, more related to the metrics. Objective 5 says "Do x'sjx's with the largest % of HHs in high resource tracts receive a significant percentage of RHNA"
- **Brown:** I do not remembering seeing a map indicating that. Nothing has been decided and truly not happy with that answer.



- **Fierce:** and I'm remembering we had a strong opposition to population based factors and instead preferring for surface-area based ones. otherwise its plausible that a city where 1% of the people live in a neighborhood with 99% of the wealth, they'll score very differently than we expect
- **Macedo:** I'm interested in hearing the baseline suggestions.
- **Nickens:** Draft Blueprint: <https://www.planbayarea.org/2050-plan/plan-bay-area-2050-Blueprint>
- **Riley:** Can we poll the HMC on that baseline question now just to get a feel of where we are?
- **Semonian:** if we use baseline with housing units the communities that develop a lot of commercial/jobs and have developed little housing end up with low allocations, which doesn't make sense to me if they are proximate to good transit and have land available for development
- **Nickens:** Comment opportunities: <https://www.planbayarea.org/2050-plan/Blueprint/Blueprint-public-comment>
- **Paul:** Regarding Solano #s, a year ago I took a tour of a number of developments just beginning construction around the new Fairfield train/bus station. If I remember correctly, when built out they would include 2,000+ homes/apartments. Is that in an unincorporated part of the Solano county?
- **Abrams:** I want to make sure we talk about other baselines like 1) land area (rather than population) and 2) excess jobs (compared to housing) as the baseline.
- **Levin:** RHNA is essentially an exercise in dividing up the RHND (440,000 new units) among all jurisdictions. The "baseline" is an initial distribution, and then we apply various adjustments to that to come up with the final RHNA allocation. The 2019 household baseline says that if a jurisdiction has 1% of the region's households, it should get 1% of the RHNA. The adjustments are to give higher and lower shares based on different factors
- **Fierce:** I'd even suggest an inverse of land-per-capita rather than solely land. Piedmont and Emeryville come to mind, where they're both small for the region but wildly different population sizes
- **Nickens:** Survey: <https://mtcbata.typeform.com/to/vLNnYjUS>
- **Pappas:** Regarding the output charts on jurisdiction potential outputs there is so much variation in the results from different factors it would be really helpful to understand how different factors contribute and interact with the Plan Bay Area 2050 baseline distribution.
- **Levin:** Victoria you froze
- **Brown:** Did we agendize that we were voting today?
- **Fierce:** wwe don't really vote though, we use the red/yellow/green approval system which then informs staff where we sit, more than a binary yes/no
- **Planthold:** ?Must we vote today? Considering a few have dropped off, would it be okay / better fi staff summarize & clarify input and have a vote at start of next mtg., or vote by e-mail before then?
- **Fierce:** I'll send this in an email later, but the information I need the most is to change the viz's to compare to previous growth patterns instead of comparing to a regional average. a commenter early on said something similar as far as undoing parts of history



- **Fierce:** that resonates with me
- **Semonian:** Would love to have time to talk to other planners in Marin and then give more feedback
- **Planthold:** YES. Resonates.
- **Abrams:** that's fine
- **Shrivastava:** yyes
- **Walsh:** I need more info on assumptions for Solano County growth in Blueprint. I this can happen offline.
- **Fierce:** sure, I'll second the motion
- **Brilliot:** I have to jump to another meeting.
- **Planthold:** NO to extend. Also another mtg., at 5 pm.
- **Brown:** I have another meeting. must leave at 5pm.
- **Riley:** I have to jump - cannot extend. Will stay as long as I can.
- **Planthold:** Extension not fair to those who have to or already had to leave.
- **Bonilla:** send an email
- **Fierce:** Yeah, send an email. discussion with fellow participants offline isn't barred
- **Brown:** I believe that we can send emails that can be sent out to everyone.
- **Riley:** Agree with James!!
- **Semonian:** Would be good to know if PBA 2050 and the "calculator" take into account land/development area
- **Clark:** They should, to some degree, to extent existing land use/zoning was an input into the model.
- **Brilliot:** Good point Jeff
- **Nickens:** +1 Jeff!
- **Shrivastava:** i agree with Jeff
- **Fligor:** I like Amber's questions: (1) do we support Plan Bay Area 2050 for direct allocation or baseline allocation; (2) do we support using HH 2019 instead; and (3) do we have other suggestions for the baseline. Also, would appreciate getting clarity on how we ensure RHNA is consistent with Plan Bay Area if we decide not to use the Plan for direct allocation or baseline allocation.
- **Semonian:** Will there be a workshop on the Blueprint that we can attend before we meet again?
- **Riley:** If we are going to red/yellow/green let's do it now!
- **Riley:** I have to jump off for a prior commitment, yet we are still going. I vote NO Blueprint.
- **Nickens:** Yes Elise. I posted the link above but there are jxdn specific virtual workshops throughout the month. Here's the link again. <https://www.planbayarea.org/2050-plan/Blueprint/Blueprint-public-comment>
- **Semonian:** Thanks!!
- **Levin:** I would like to see the next meeting have less informational presentation and more discussion and decision making. This will require that all of us review the informational materials in advance, but we are running out of time and should be using our meeting time to discuss alternatives and come to some consensus on recommendations.
- **Shibley:** no decision point today - just hearing what you need to get there in August



- **Semonian:** I agree with Jeff above - more time to discuss
- **Fierce:** for consensus building and intent signalling purposes: my preference at this moment is HH 2019 with income shift, but I also want to know why the income brackets are different between PBA and RHNA
- **Nickens:** I agree w/ Jeff's reco. The informational presentations could be sent in advance along with the packet materials. Also fyi many of these informational presentations are presented to the MTC/ABAG boards before our meetings which are all available for the public to view at <https://abag.ca.gov> and <https://mtc.ca.gov>.
- **Fierce:** available buildable area is a function of local zoning which is totally within a city's control. I don't think it should be a factor because it veers into consideration of historic performance.
- **Strellis:** Please email rhna@thecivicedge.com with your comments
- **Levin:** Page 100 of today's PDF explains what factors were used for Jobs/Housing Crescent and the 3-factor Bottom Up approaches.
- **Pappas:** Land area that is not local, state, or federal park land or a priority conservation area would be a helpful component per Pat's suggestion and Josh's suggestion on job/housing imbalances
- **Levin:** That's exactly why we need the data tables behind the charts in Item 6B Appendix
- **Walsh:** Land area as an option can only work if many things are excepted out: agriculture, parks/open space, areas that don't have urban services available, etc. Keep it to urbanized lands only.
- **Fierce:** also: quick shout out to whoever made the bar charts. thank you for using colorblind friendly colors, please make sure that translates to our maps
- **Pappas:** UrbanSim's methodology is part of why Plan Bay Area 2050's housing distribution is resulting the way that it is. Some types of small parcel infill housing have historically been difficult to build because there are both zoning and process barriers as well as construction cost barriers that urban sim may be reacting to that gives preference to large parcel redevelopments in the South Bay. There are strategies that could also help address these barriers to small infill
- **Abrams:** thank you staff. It's a hard job!

Public Comments on Items Non-Agenda

- **Steven Buss, YIMBY Action SF:** General comment about the colors chosen for maps. Red should not indicate high growth. It implies to the viewer that is a bad thing, which is not the case. Color choices inform how people understand the graphics. Either totally neutral colors or frame it to indicate that growth is good.
- **Kyle Kelley:** Suggested the color palette viridis to accommodate for any visual impaired people and pre-conceived color assumptions.
- **Castro:** 10 comments submitted by email, also posted online.
- **Arreguin:** Thanks for your time. I agree that the next time we meet, we should vote on Blueprint or not so we can go from there. The next meeting will be on August 13.

