

**ASSOCIATION OF BAY  
AREA GOVERNMENTS**  
Meeting Transcript

**August 28, 2020**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**ABAG HOUSING METHODOLOGY COMMITTEE**  
**FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 2020, 9:05 AM**

**JESSE ARREGUIN**, CHAIR: GOOD MORNING EVERYONE. THIS MEETING OF THE HOUSING METHODOLOGY COMMITTEE IS MEETING. IF ATTENDEES COULD PLEASE MUTE THEMSELVES, UNLESS YOU ARE SPEAKING. STAFF CAN NOW PLAY THE COVID-19 MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT. DUE TO COVID-19, THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED AS A ZOOM WEBINAR PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20, WHICH SUSPENDS CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT. THIS MEETING IS BEING WEBCAST ON THE ABAG WEB SITE. THE CHAIR WILL CALL UPON COMMISSIONERS, PRESENTERS, STAFF, AND OTHER SPEAKERS BY NAME AND ASK THAT THEY SPEAK CLEARLY AND STATE THEIR NAMES BEFORE GIVING COMMENTS OR REMARKS. PERSONS PARTICIPATING VIA WEBCAST AND ZOOM WITH THEIR CAMERAS ENABLED, ARE REMINDED THAT THEIR ACTIVITIES ARE VISIBLE TO VIEWERS. COMMISSIONERS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATING BY ZOOM WISHING TO SPEAK, SHOULD USE THE RAISED HAND FEATURE OR DIAL STAR NINE, AND THE CHAIR WILL CALL UPON THEM AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME. TELECONFERENCE ATTENDEES WILL BE CALLED UPON BY THE LAST FOUR DIGITS OF THEIR PHONE NUMBER. IT IS REQUESTED THAT PUBLIC SPEAKERS STATE THEIR NAMES AND ORGANIZATION, BUT PROVIDING SUCH INFORMATION IS VOLUNTARY. WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AT INFO@BAYAREAMETRO.GOV BY 5:00 P.M. YESTERDAY WILL BE POSTED TO THE ONLINE AGENDA AND ENTERED INTO THE RECORD,

**August 28, 2020**

1 BUT WILL NOT BE READ OUT LOUD. IF AUTHORS OF THE WRITTEN  
2 CORRESPONDENCE WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK, THEY ARE FREE TO DO SO,  
3 AND THEY SHOULD RAISE THEIR HAND AND THE CHAIR WILL CALL UPON  
4 THEM AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME. A ROLL CALL VOTE WILL BE TAKEN  
5 FOR ALL ACTION ITEMS. PANELISTS SHOULD NOTE THAT THE CHAT  
6 FEATURE IS ACTIVE, HOWEVER PLEASE BE AWARE THAT ANYTHING TYPED  
7 INTO THE CHAT WILL BE SUBJECT TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE. CHAT  
8 FEATURE IS NOT ACTIVE TO ATTENDEES. IN ORDER TO GET THE FULL  
9 ZOOM EXPERIENCE, PLEASE MAKE SURE YOUR APPLICATION IS UP TO  
10 DATE.

11

12 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. BE ABAG  
13 CLERK OF THE BOARD PLEASE CONDUCT A ROLL CALL TO CONFIRM  
14 WHETHER A CORE UM IS PRESENT?

15

16 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** YES, SIR. SUSAN ADAMS? THANK YOU. I SEE  
17 YOU.

18

19 **SUSAN ADAMS:** PRESENT.

20

21 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** ANITA ADDISON?

22

23 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

24

25 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** JESSE ARREQUIN?

August 28, 2020

1

2 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:**

3

4 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

5

6 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** RUPINDER?

7

8 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

9

10 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** RICK BONILLA?

11

12 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

13

14 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** MICHAEL BRILLIOT?

15

16 **MICHAEL BRILLIOT:** PRESENT.

17

18 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** MONICA BROWN?

19

20 **MONICA BROWN:** YES.

21

22 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** AMANDA BROWN-STEVENS? IS ABSENT. PAUL

23 CAMPOS. IS ABSENT. ELLEN CLARK?

24

25 **ELLEN CLARK:** PRESENT.

August 28, 2020

1

2 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** DIANE DILLON?

3

4 **DIANE DILLON:** PRESENT.

5

6 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** FOREST EBBS?

7

8 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

9

10 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** PAT ECKLUND?

11

12 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

13

14 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** JONATHON FEARN IS ABSENT. VICTORIA FIERCE?

15

16 **VICTORIA FIERCE:** HERE.

17

18 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** NEYSA FLIGOR?

19

20 **NEYSA FLIGOR:** HERE.

21

22 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** I HAVE YOU. THANK YOU. MINDY GENTRY?

23

24 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** RUSSELL HANCOCK IS ABSENT. WELTON JORDAN?

2

3 **WELTON JORDAN:** HERE.

4

5 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** BRANDON KLINE IS ABSENT? JEFF LEVIN?

6

7 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

8

9 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** SCHOLTE LITTLEHALE?

10

11 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

12

13 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** CONNIE?

14

15 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

16

17 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** FERNANDO MARTI?

18

19 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

20

21 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** RODNEY NICKENS?

22

23 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

24

25 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** JAMES PAPPAS?

August 28, 2020

1

2 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

3

4 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** JULIE PIERCE?

5

6 **JULIE PIERCE:** HERE.

7

8 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** BOB PLANTHOLD IS ABSENT.

9

10 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** DARIN RANELETTI?

11

12 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

13

14 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** CARLOS ROMERO?

15

16 **SPEAKER:** IN ATTENDANCE.

17

18 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** NELL?

19

20 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

21

22 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** ELISE SEMONIAN?

23

24 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** AARTI SHRIVASTAVA?

2

3 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

4

5 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** SMITH?

6

7 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

8

9 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** MATT WALSH?

10

11 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

12

13 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** AND NOAH?

14

15 **SPEAKER:** HERE.

16

17 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** QUORUM IS

18

19 **SPEAKER:** PRESENT.

20

21 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THANK YOU. A QUORUM IS PRESENT. BEFORE

22 WE PROCEED TO ITEM TWO, I WANT TO FIRST EXPRESS MY DEEPEST

23 SYMPATHY ON BEHALF OF THE ABAG EXECUTIVE BOARD TO ALL OF OUR

24 NEIGHBORS WHO HAVE BEEN AFFECTED BY THE CATASTROPHIC FIRES IN

25 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA THESE PAST FEW WEEKS. AND AT THE REQUEST

**August 28, 2020**

1 OF SUPERVISOR BROWN, I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A MOMENT OF SILENCE  
2 FOR ALL OF THOSE WHO HAVE LOST THEIR LIVES IN THESE FIRES. SO  
3 LET'S TAKE A MOMENT OF SILENCE. OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH  
4 COLLEAGUES. SO I WOULD NOW LIKE TO GO TO ITEM TWO. PUBLIC  
5 COMMENT. THIS IS PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THIS MORNING'S  
6 AGENDA. ARE THERE ANY ATTENDEES WHO WOULD LIKE TO OFFER PUBLIC  
7 COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THIS MORNING'S HMC AGENDA. IF SO  
8 PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND, OR IF YOU ARE PHONING IN PLEASE PRESS  
9 STAR NINE. I DO NOT SEE ANY RAISED HANDS. MR. CASTRO WERE  
10 THERE ANY WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

11

12 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** NONE.

13

14 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THAT COMPLETES THIS ITEM. LET'S GO TO  
15 ITEM THREE, THE CHAIR'S REPORT. AND INCLUDED IN THE PACKET  
16 WERE A NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS UNDER ITEM THREE, WHICH INCLUDE  
17 THE MEETING NOTES FROM OUR LAST MEETING. A CORRESPONDENCE  
18 RECEIVED FROM HMC MEMBERS SINCE OUR LAST MEETING AND A COPY OF  
19 THE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION FOR REFERENCE. I WANT TO PROVIDE A  
20 FEW ANNOUNCEMENTS REGARDING TODAY'S MEETING. THIS WILL BE A  
21 THREE HOUR MEETING. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A TEN MINUTE BREAK.  
22 AND THERE MAY BE A DESIRE FOR ADDITIONAL TIME FOR DISCUSSION.  
23 IF HMC MEMBERS ARE WILLING, AND SO WE MAY WANT TO EXTEND  
24 BEYOND THREE HOURS. THERE ARE THREE AREAS THAT THE HMC IS  
25 BEING ASKED TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF ON TODAY, TO HELP

**August 28, 2020**

1 FURTHER REFINE THE METHODOLOGY. AND REALLY, THIS IS INTENDED  
2 AS A TEMPERATURE CHECK TO HELP PROVIDE INPUT SO STAFF CAN  
3 NARROW THE OPTIONS AND BRING BACK INFORMATION AND A MORE  
4 COMPLETE METHODOLOGY AT OUR NEXT MEETING IN SEPTEMBER. THREE  
5 AREAS HMC IS BEING ASKED TO PROVIDE DIRECTION ON TO STAFF  
6 TODAY ARE WHETHER TO ADJUST THE INCOME GROUPINGS FOR THE  
7 BOTTOM-UP APPROACH. TWO EVALUATION AND MODIFICATION. AND THREE  
8 WHETHER THE SIX METHODOLOGIES PRESENTED IN OUR PACKET DOES THE  
9 HMC WANT TO CONTINUE CONSIDERING. SO THE INTENT IS TO FOR THAT  
10 OAT SCOPE SO THAT WE CAN HAVE A MORE INFORMED DISCUSSION AT  
11 OUR MEETING AND ACTUALLY MAKE A DECISION AT THE NEXT MEETING,  
12 A FORMAL ACTION. DECISION POINTS WE'RE ASKING FOR TODAY ARE  
13 PROVIDING DIRECTION TO STAFF ACTION FOR THE NEXT MEETING.  
14 FINAL VOTE ON THE METHODOLOGY WILL BE AT OUR MEETING IN  
15 SEPTEMBER. THAT WILL BE A FORMAL VOTE AND THE MEETING TODAY IS  
16 INTENDED TO HELP REFINE SIMILAR TO WHAT WE DID AT OUR LAST  
17 MEETING. SO, TODAY'S MEETING IS STRUCTURED SUCH THAT THERE  
18 WILL BE ONE PRESENTATION FROM STAFF, AND THEN WE'LL HAVE GROUP  
19 DISCUSSION, AND WE ENCOURAGE EVERYONE TO PLEASE WEIGH IN TO  
20 CONTRIBUTE. SO THAT WE CAN MAKE OUR BEST RECOMMENDATION TO  
21 ABAG MTC STAFF. I ALSO LASTLY WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE AT OUR ABAG  
22 EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING LAST WEEK, WE RECEIVED A PRESENTATION  
23 FROM STAFF ON THE METHODOLOGY PROCESS TO DATE. PARTICULARLY  
24 THE WORK THAT WAS DONE AT OUR LAST MEETING, ON THE BASELINE  
25 INPUT FACTORS AND IN ADDITION WE HAD SOME DISCUSSION OF THE

August 28, 2020

1 BOTTOM-UP FACTORS AS WELL. AND I EMPHASIZED VERY STRONGLY THAT  
2 THE HMC HAS BEEN WORKING HARD FOR ALMOST A YEAR NOW, AND HAS  
3 DONE A REALLY INCREDIBLE JOB, AND THAT GENERALLY WE HAVE SORT  
4 OF, UNANIMITY AROUND OUR PRIORITIES THAT ALIGN AROUND A GOOD  
5 PATH FORWARD METHODOLOGY A PATH THAT MEETS STATUTORY  
6 OBJECTIVES AS WELL AS PRIORITIES REGIONALLY AND ABAG SHOULD  
7 GIVE GREAT DEFERENCE TO THE WORK OF THE HOUSING METHODOLOGY  
8 COMMITTEE, GIVEN THE EXPERTISE AND THE WORK THAT'S BEEN DONE  
9 OVER THE PAST YEAR. AND I THINK MANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE ABAG  
10 EXECUTIVE BOARD EXPRESSED THEIR APPRECIATION FOR ALL OF THE  
11 HARD WORK OF THE HMC AS WELL. I WANT TO PROVIDE THAT UPDATE.  
12 AND GENERALLY, BUSINESS THERE SEEMED TO BE -- THAT THERE  
13 DIDN'T SEEM TO BE DIVERGENT VIEWS AND CONCERNS AROUND THE  
14 DIRECTION THAT THE HMC IS MOVING IN, BUT I JUST WANT TO SHARE  
15 THAT THERE WAS A LOT OF APPRECIATION FOR ALL THE HARD WORK  
16 THAT YOU HAVE DONE, AND CERTAINLY, I EXPRESSED MY DEEPEST  
17 APPRECIATION TO ALL OF YOU. WE USED TO HAVE BOX LUNCHEES AND  
18 BREAKFASTS AND NOW WE DON'T HAVE THAT. I APPRECIATE YOU,  
19 DESPITE NOT GETTING A FEW LUNCH, TO BE HERE, AND CONTRIBUTING  
20 YOUR TIME, AND YOUR DEDICATION TO THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE WHICH  
21 IS GOING TO DEFINE THE FUTURE OF OUR REGION AND WHETHER PEOPLE  
22 CAN AFFORD TO LIVE IN OUR REGION. SO THANK YOU ALL SO MUCH.  
23 WITH THAT I'LL ASK IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE  
24 PANELISTS OR COMMENTS? I DO NOT SEE ANY RAISED HANDS. IS THERE  
25 ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEM THREE, THE CHAIR'S REPORT. IF SO

**August 28, 2020**

1 PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND OR PRESS STAR NINE. I DO NOT SEE ANY  
2 RAISED HANDS. MR. CASTRO WERE THERE ANY WRITTEN COMMENTS  
3 SOMEONE SUBMITTED ON THIS ITEM.

4

5 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THERE WERE NONE.

6

7 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THAT COMPLETES THIS ITEM. WE'LL GO TO  
8 ITEM FOUR CONSENT CALENDAR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 13TH  
9 MEETING. IS THERE APPROVAL?

10

11 **JULIE PIERCE:** PIERCE MOVES.

12

13 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THERE WAS A SECOND?

14

15 **SPEAKER:** COUNCILMEMBER BONILLA.

16

17 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** MOTION AND SECOND. ANY DISCUSSION? I DO  
18 NOT SEE ANY RAISED HANDS. LET'S GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT. IF YOU  
19 WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK RAISE YOUR HAND OR PRESS STAR NINE. I DO  
20 NOT SEE ANY RAISED HANDS. MR. CASTRO ANY WRITTEN COMMENTS  
21 RECEIVED ON THIS ITEM.

22

23 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THERE WERE NONE.

24

25 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** LET'S CALL THE ROLL ON THE MOTION.

August 28, 2020

1

2 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** [ROLL CALL VOTE]. MOTION PASSES.

3

4 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT COMPLETES OUR  
5 ACTION ITEM FOR TODAY. WE'LL GO TO ITEM FIVE. THIS IS A  
6 PRESENTATION DISCUSSION ON REFINING RHNA METHODOLOGY. REFINING  
7 RHNA METHODOLOGY CONCEPTS FOCUS ON REFINING THE FACTORS AND  
8 WEIGHTS THAT BEST COMPLEMENT A METHODOLOGY USING THE 2050  
9 HOUSEHOLDS (BLUEPRINT) BASELINE ALLOCATION AND THE BOTTOM-UP  
10 INCOME ALLOCATION APPROACH. AND GILLIAN ADAMS WILL GIVE THE  
11 PRESENTATION. I'LL TURN IT OVER TO GILLIAN.

12

13 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING EVERYBODY. IF WE COULD  
14 PULL UP THE SLIDES PLEASE. SO AS CHAIR ARREGUIN MENTIONED OUR  
15 MEETING TODAY IS GOING TO HAVE A SIMILAR FORMAT TO OUR LAST  
16 MEETING ON AUGUST 13TH. TO START I'M GOING TO WALK THROUGH  
17 INFORMATION ABOUT SEVERAL TOPICS FOR STAFF TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK  
18 SO WE CAN CONTINUE TO REFINE THE METHODOLOGY. AT THE LAST  
19 MEETING YOU USED THE MODIFIED COP CONSENSUS PROCESS TO USE  
20 2050 HOUSEHOLDS FROM PLANNED BAY AREA BLUEPRINT AS THE  
21 BASELINE ALLOCATION AND TO USE THE BOTTOM-UP CONCEPT FOR  
22 ALLOCATING THE INCOME. TODAY'S DISCUSSION WILL FOCUS ON THREE  
23 DECISION POINTS. NUMBER ONE, DOES THE HMC RECOMMEND ADJUSTING  
24 THE BOTTOM-UP INCOME GROUPED TO MODERATE INCOME UNITS  
25 ALLOCATED USING SAME FACTORS AS VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME UNITS.

**August 28, 2020**

1 NUMBER TWO DOES HMC RECOMMEND USING THE COMPREHENSIVE  
2 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION METRICS AS DRAFTED TO BETTER ENSURE  
3 METHODOLOGY OPTIONS MEET STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND ADVANCE  
4 REGIONAL POLICY GOALS. AND I JUST REALIZED, I'M ON THE WRONG  
5 SLIDE. COULD YOU ADVANCE THE SLIDE PLEASE. ONE MORE? THANK  
6 YOU. AND IN NUMBER THREE WHICH OF THE SIX METHODOLOGIES DOES  
7 HMC RECOMMEND, CONTINUING TO CONSIDER AS PERFORMING BEST IN  
8 MEETING THE RHNA STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND PRODUCING BEST  
9 OUTCOMES FOR THE REGION. SIMILAR TO WHAT WAS DISCUSSED AT THE  
10 AUGUST 15TH MEETING THESE DECISIONS ARE INTERRELATED THE  
11 INFORMATION PRESENTED FOR EACH TOPIC COULD ALSO INFORM YOUR  
12 DISCUSSIONS AT OTHER TOPICS. FOR THIS REASON I'M GOING TO WALK  
13 THROUGH ALL OF THE MATERIALS BEFORE WE HAVE OPPORTUNITY  
14 FOLLOWING MY PRESENTATION FOR CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND  
15 DISCUSSIONS ABOUT DECISION POINT NUMBER ONE WE'LL THEN TAKE  
16 THE OTHER DECISION POINTS IN ORDER. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO,  
17 AGAIN, DECISION POINT NUMBER ONE IS ABOUT REGROUPING THE  
18 INCOME CATEGORIES FOR THE BOTTOM-UP METHODOLOGY. WE STARTED  
19 THIS DISCUSSION AT THE LAST MEETING. TO RECAP AN IDEA PUT  
20 FORWARD BY HMC, MODERATING UNITS AT LOW AND VERY LOW INCOME  
21 UNITS CHANGED BY MODERATE INCOME UNITS USING SAME FACTORS AS  
22 ABOVE MODERATE INCOME UNITS. PRIMARY RATIONALE FOR GROUPED  
23 PRIMARY INCOME UNITS WITH LOWER INCOME UNITS MODERATE INCOME  
24 UNITS ARE NOT PRODUCED BY THE MARKET. MODERATE INCOME UNITS  
25 ARE SIMILAR TO LOWER INCOMING UNIT IN THAT REQUIRE GREATER

August 28, 2020

1 POLICY INTERVENTION. THIS ADJUSTMENT REFLECTS THE FACT THAT  
2 MANY MODERATE STRUGGLE HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS FOR THE MODERATE  
3 OPTIONS HMC HAS DISCUSSED TO DATE ADDING LOWER INCOME UNITS  
4 USING SAME FACTORS OF WEIGHTS WOULD DIRECT MORE MODERATE  
5 HOUSING TO THESE HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS HELPING TO EXPAND  
6 HOUSING CHOICES BROADLY IN THESE COMMUNITIES THIS CHANGE WOULD  
7 ONLY AFFECT HOW MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE DISTRIBUTED  
8 THROUGHOUT THE REGION NO IMPACT ON THE NUMBER OF UNITS A  
9 JURISDICTION RECEIVES IN ANY OF THE OTHER INCOME CATEGORIES IN  
10 ADDITION SINCE MODERATE INCOME UNITSES ARE 17 PERCENT OF THE  
11 REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION THE REGROUPED ONLY AFFECTS  
12 A SMALL SHARE OF THE UNITS ALLOCATED BY THE RHNA METHODOLOGY.  
13 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. IN TODAY'S MEETING STAFF HAS ANALYZED THREE  
14 DIFFERENT METHODOLOGY OPTIONS THAT I'LL DESCRIBE IN MORE  
15 DETAIL IN THE NEXT SECTION THESE OPTIONS INCLUDE THE TWO  
16 BOTTOM-UP METHODOLOGIES PREVIOUSLY SHARED WITH THE HMC AS WELL  
17 AS A NEW OPTION THAT EMPHASIZES USE OF ACCESS TO HIGH  
18 OPPORTUNITIES AREAS FACTOR FOR NOW WE'RE NOT FOCUSED ON  
19 COMPARING THREE METHODOLOGIES TO EACH OTHER BUT RATHER ON  
20 COMPARING VERSION A AND B OF EACH OPTION VERSION A METHODOLOGY  
21 SHOWS RESULTS MODERATE ALLOCATION AS THE SAME AS ABOVE  
22 MODERATE INCOME UNITS ORIGINAL STAFF PROPOSAL VERSION B OF  
23 EACH OPTION SHOWS RESULTS WHEN MODERATE USING SAME FACTORS AS  
24 VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME UNITS PROPOSED BY HMC MEMBERS  
25 APPENDICES IN YOUR PACKETS SHOW RESULTS FROM VERSION A AND B

August 28, 2020

1 FOR ALL THREE OF METHODOLOGY OPTIONS. MAPS SHOWN HERE ARE  
2 DIFFERENT THAN THE MAPS WE USUALLY SHOW. THAT THEY ARE NOT  
3 SHOWING THE JURISDICTION GROWTH RATES THAT RESULT FROM EACH  
4 OPTION. INSTEAD, THEY'RE SHOWING THE CHANGE IN EACH  
5 JURISDICTION'S GROWTH RATE WHEN MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE  
6 ALLOCATED USING THE SAME FACTORS AS LOWER INCOME UNITS WHICH  
7 IS AT VERSION B INSTEAD OF THE FACTORS FOR ALLOCATING ABOVE  
8 MODERATE INCOME UNITS VERSION A SINCE EACH METHODOLOGY USES  
9 DIFFERENCE FACTORS AND WEIGHTS FOR ALLOCATING MODERATE UNITS  
10 AFFECTS ON JURISDICTION WILL VARY DEPENDING ON THE  
11 METHODOLOGY. THESE MAPS DEMONSTRATE THAT JUST ADJUSTING HOW  
12 MODERATE INCOMES ARE ALLOCATED -- 17 PERCENT OF THE REGION'S  
13 HOUSING NEEDS. GENERALLY SPEAKING MAIN IMPACTS IS THAT  
14 JURISDICTIONS WITH HIGH INCOME HOUSEHOLDS AND HIGH RESOURCE  
15 CENSUS TRACTS SEE A SLIGHT INCREASE IN MODERATE INCOME  
16 ALLOCATIONS AND THEIR OVERALL RHNA WHILE LARGER CITIES AND  
17 MORE ECONOMICALLY DIVERSE JURISDICTION SEE A SLIGHT DECREASE  
18 IN MODERATE INCOME ALLOCATIONS IN OVERALL RHNA. WHAT YOU SEE  
19 HERE IS THE PLACES THAT HAVE THE DARKER GREEN ARE PLACE WHERE  
20 IS THEY WOULD HAVE AN INCREASE IN THEIR MODERATE INCOME UNITS  
21 AND THE PLACES IN KIND OF THE DARKER RED OR PINK ARE THE PLACE  
22 WHERE IS THEY WOULD SEE A SMALLER SHARE OF MODERATE INCOME  
23 UNITS. IMPACTS STEM FROM THE FACTORS IN THE METHODOLOGIES  
24 THEMSELVES WHICH EMPHASIZE THAT ACCESS TO HIGH OPPORTUNITY  
25 AREAS FACTOR FOR ALLOCATING LOWER INCOME UNITS. TO VARYING

August 28, 2020

1 DEGREES DEPENDING ON THE METHODOLOGY ALLOCATING UNITS USING  
2 SAME FACTOR AS VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME UNITS TENDS TO INCREASE  
3 ALLOCATIONS FOR JURISDICTION IN TRI-VALLEY SOUTHERN PORTION OF  
4 SAN MATEO COUNTY WESTERN SANTA CLARA COUNTY AND PORTIONS OF  
5 CONSTITUTE COST COUNTY AND AGAIN THIS MAP IS SHOWING THE  
6 DIFFERENCE SO THE PLACES THAT ARE MORE GREEN ARE THE PLACES  
7 THAT ARE SEEING THE HIGHER IMPACT ON THEIR MODERATE INCOME  
8 UNITS FROM THIS CHANGE. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. DECISION POINT  
9 NUMBER ONE ASKS DOES HMC RECOMMEND ADJUSTING BOTTOM-UP INCOME  
10 GROUPED USING SAME FACTORS AS VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME UNITS  
11 RECOMMENDATION IS TO ADJUST INCOME GROUPINGS SO THAT MODERATE  
12 INCOME UNITS ARE ALLOCATING USING SAME FACTORS AS LOWER INCOME  
13 UNITS THIS APPROACH BETTER REFLECTS PROJECTS BETTER IN THE BAY  
14 AREA AND PROMOTING DIVERSE HOUSING CHOICE IN COMMUNITIES WITH  
15 HIGH INCOME HOUSEHOLDS AND HIGH RESOURCE TRACTS.  
16 RECOMMENDATION ALWAYS INFORMED BY THE PERFORMANCE OF THE  
17 EVALUATION METRICS WHICH I'LL TALK MORE IN DETAIL AT THE END  
18 OF THE PRESENTATION. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER  
19 FOR TODAY'S MEETING STAFF HAS ANALYZED THREE DIFFERENT  
20 METHODOLOGY OPTIONS AS A STARTING PLACE FOR DISCUSSING THE  
21 BEST FACTORS AND WEIGHTS TO INCLUDE IN THE METHODOLOGY. ALL  
22 THREE OF THESE OPTIONS USE THE 2050 HOUSEHOLD'S BASELINE  
23 ALLOCATION FROM PLANNED BAY AREA AND THE BOTTOM-UP INCOME  
24 APPROACH. THREE OPTIONS INCLUDE OPTION ONE, JOBS EMPHASIS,  
25 WHICH IS PREVIOUSLY KNOWN AS THE BOTTOM-UP THREE FACTOR

August 28, 2020

1 METHODOLOGY. OPTION TWO, HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS AND JOBS WHICH  
2 WAS PREVIOUSLY KNOWN AS THE BOTTOM-UP TWO FACTOR METHODOLOGY,  
3 AND OPTION THREE, HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS EMPHASIS, A NEW TWO  
4 FACTOR OPTION THAT EMPHASIZES THE USE OF THE ACCESS TO HIGH  
5 OPPORTUNITIES AREAS FACTOR TO ALLOCATE UNIT IN ALL INCOME  
6 CATEGORIES. THE SUMMARY HERE SHOWS VERSION B OF THESE  
7 METHODOLOGY OPTIONS, WHERE MOD REALITY INCOME UNITS ARE LOWER  
8 INCOME UNITS -- THIS IS STAFF RECOMMENDATION ABOUT LOWER  
9 INCOME GROUPINGS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. TO BE CLEAR, STAFF DID  
10 ANALYZE THAT VERSION A INCOME GROUPINGS AND VERSION B INCOME  
11 GROUPINGS FOR ALL METHODOLOGIES SHOWN HERE AND THAT  
12 INFORMATION IS INCLUDED IN YOUR PACKET. ANALYSIS FOR ALL OF  
13 THESE SIX DIFFERENT OPTIONS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THESE MAPS ARE  
14 SIMILAR TO THE ONES FROM PAST MEETINGS THAT SHOW THE GROWTH  
15 RATE THAT EAST JURISDICTION WOULD EXPERIENCE AS A RESULT OF  
16 THE TOTAL ALLOCATION FROM EACH OF THE THREE METHODOLOGIES  
17 THESE MAPS ARE SHOWING RESULTS FOR VERSION B WHERE THE  
18 MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE GROUPED WITH THE LOWER INCOMING  
19 UNITS JURISDICTION WITH THE DARKEST BROWN EXPERIENCED HIGHEST  
20 GROWTH RATE WHILE THOSE IN THE LIGHT GRAY EXPERIENCED LOWEST  
21 GROWTH RATES THE THREE OPTIONS SHOW SIMILAR AMOUNTS OF RHNA  
22 CONCENTRATED IN SILICON VALLEY AND SOUTH BAY. SAN FRANCISCO  
23 AND OAKLAND RECEIVED THE HIGHEST SHARES OF GROWTH IN OPTION  
24 ONE B. THIS IS EMPHASIS ON HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS, OPTION 3B  
25 DISTRIBUTES HIGHER SHARES OF RHNA UNITS TO JURISDICTION IN

August 28, 2020

1 MARIN COUNTY AND THE TRI-VALLEY AND EAST BAY. IN ALL THREE  
2 METHODOLOGIES MOST JURISDICTION IN EAST CONTRA COSTA COUNTY  
3 NAPA SOLANO AND SONOMA COUNTIES EXPERIENCED SLOWER GROWTH  
4 COMPARED TO THE REST OF THE REGION. HMC WILL HAVE OPPORTUNITY  
5 TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION ABOUT PREFERRED METHODOLOGY OPTION IN  
6 DECISION POINT NUMBER 32. AFTER CONSIDERING AN EXPANDED  
7 PERFORMANCE METRICS EVALUATION I'LL DETAIL IN THE NEXT  
8 SECTION. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. AND THIS SLIDE SHOWS THE  
9 CONCLUSIONS THAT I MENTIONED ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY RESULTS.  
10 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO AS NOTED PREVIOUSLY, HOUSING ELEMENT LAW  
11 REQUIRES THAT THE RHNA METHODOLOGY MEET THE FIVE STATUTORY  
12 OBJECTIVES OF RHNA AND THAT IT'S CONSISTENT WITH THE  
13 FORECASTED DEVELOPMENT PATTERN FROM PLANNED BAY AREA 2050.  
14 STAFF HAS ACCESSED THE SIX METHODOLOGY OPTIONS MENTIONED ABOVE  
15 FOR CONSISTENCY WE PLANNED BAY AREA 2050, AND FOR HOW WELL  
16 THEY ADDRESS THE REQUIRED RHNA OBJECTIVES. AS NOTED AT THE  
17 AUGUST 13TH MEETING THE APPROACH THAT THE ABAG MTC STAFF HAS  
18 IDENTIFIED FOR DETERMINING A CONSISTENCY BETWEEN RHNA AND THE  
19 PLAN IS BASED ON A COMPARISON OF THE EIGHT YEAR RHNA HOUSING  
20 GROWTH AND THE 30 YEAR PLANNED BAY AREA HOUSING GROWTH.  
21 PLANNED BAY AREA 2050 GROWTH PROJECTIONS ARE IDENTIFIED AT THE  
22 COUNTY AND SUBCOUNTY LEVELS. SINCE THE RHNA ALLOCATIONS ARE AT  
23 A JURISDICTIONAL LEVEL, IT HAS BEEN SUMMED TO ENABLE  
24 COMPARISON WITH THE PLAN'S GROWTH PROJECTIONS. IF THE EIGHT  
25 YEAR GROWTH FROM RHNA DOES NOT EXCEED THE PLAN'S 30 YEAR

August 28, 2020

1 GROWTH AT THE COUNTY SUBCOUNTY LEVELS THE RHNA PLAN WILL BE  
2 FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT THIS APPROACH PROVIDES HMC SOME DEGREE  
3 OF FLEXIBILITY WHILE ENSURING NEAR TERM HOUSING GOALS REMAIN  
4 IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE HOUSING VISION IN PLANNED BAY AREA 2050.  
5 USING THIS APPROACH, STAFF DETERMINED THAT THERE ARE NO  
6 CONSISTENCY ISSUES FOR ANY OF THE OPTIONS AS THEY'RE CURRENTLY  
7 CONSTRUCTED. AS HMC CONTINUES TO MAKE REFINEMENTS AS TO MOVES  
8 TOWARDS THE PROPOSED METHODOLOGY STAFF WILL EVALUATE THE  
9 OPTIONS FOR CONSISTENCY AND CONSIDER POTENTIAL MITIGATIONS IN  
10 THE RHNA OR PLANNED BAY AREA PROCESSES IF ANY ISSUES ARISE.  
11 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. IN ADDITION EVALUATING CONSISTENCY WITH  
12 PLANNED BAY AREA STAFF HAS ALSO DEVELOPED A SET OF PERFORMANCE  
13 METRICS TO PROVIDE MEMBERS WITH FEEDBACK ABOUT HOW THE  
14 METHODOLOGIES ADDRESS THE FIVE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES FOR RHNA  
15 AND FURTHER REGIONAL PLANNING GOALS. THE PURPOSE OF THESE  
16 METRICS IS TO PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION THAT CAN HELP  
17 INFORM THE HMC'S DECISIONS ABOUT HOW TO EFFECTIVELY BALANCE  
18 THE RHNA POLICY GOALS IN THE METHODOLOGY. STAFF WEIGHS METRICS  
19 IN EVALUATING THE RHNA METHODOLOGY COMPARED WITH OTHER REGION  
20 IN CALIFORNIA. METRICS ARE USED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ORGANIZED  
21 AROUND THE FIVE RHNA OBJECTIVES. THEY'RE TYPICALLY STRUCTURED  
22 AS A COMPARISON OF THE TOP 25 JURISDICTION IN THE REGION FOR A  
23 PARTICULAR CHARACTER SUCH AS THE TOP 25 JURISDICTION FOR  
24 HOUSING COST AND THE REST OF THE JURISDICTION IN THE REGION.  
25 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE HMC'S FIRST BEGAN TO DISCUSS POTENTIAL

**August 28, 2020**

1 EVALUATION METRICS AT ITS MAY MEETING STAFF PREPARED A REVISED  
2 SET OF METRICS BASED ON HMC'S FEEDBACK THAT WE ADDED TO THE  
3 ONLINE TOOL AND USED TO EVALUATE THE OPTIONS DISCUSSED IN JULY  
4 AND AUGUST. FOR TODAY'S MEETING STAFF IS INTRODUCING SEVERAL  
5 NEW METRICS TO COMPLIMENT THE 2050ING STEPS WHICH I'LL  
6 DESCRIBE IN MORE DETAIL IN THE NEXT SLIDE TODAY WE'RE SEEKING  
7 A DECISION FROM HMC ABOUT WHETHER A MORE COMPREHENSIVE SET OF  
8 METRICS IS WHAT STAFF SHOULD USE TO EVALUATE METHODOLOGY  
9 OPTION IN ADVANCE OF THE LAST MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 18TH. NEXT  
10 SLIDE PLEASE. AS I MENTIONED, THE INITIAL METRICS THAT STAFF  
11 DEVELOPED WERE BASED ON THE ANALYSIS THAT HCD USED IN LETTERS  
12 TO OTHER COUNSELS AND GOVERNMENTS ABOUT EVALUATING  
13 METHODOLOGIES. SEVERAL FOCUSED ON WHETHER JURISDICTION WITH  
14 CERTAIN CHARACTERISTIC RECEIVED A CERTAIN PORTION OF RHNA WITH  
15 LOWER INCOME UNITS. IN PAST HCD SEVERAL MEMBERS INTERESTED IN  
16 EXPLORING METRICS THAT EXAMINE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF UNITS  
17 ASSIGNED TO A JURISDICTION. THIS GOES BACK TO THE CONCERN THAT  
18 HAS BEEN MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY THAT ASSIGNING A HIGH PERCENTAGE  
19 OF AFFORDABLE UNITS TO A JURISDICTION IS NOT PARTICULARLY  
20 IMPACTFUL IF THE TOTAL ALLOCATION TO THAT JURISDICTION IS  
21 RELATIVELY SMALL. STAFF AGREES THAT IT'S HELPFUL TO HAVE A  
22 MORE COMPREHENSIVE LOOK AT WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH THE  
23 ALLOCATIONS FROM THE METHODOLOGY TO SEE THE IMPACT ON TOTAL  
24 ALLOCATIONS AND LOWER INCOME UNITS FOR THIS REASON SOLELY  
25 FOCUSING ON PERCENTAGE OF UNITS STAFF IS PROPOSING TO ADD A

**August 28, 2020**

1 METRICS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE JURISDICTION THAT RECEIVE A  
2 SHARE OF THE HOUSING NEED THAT IS PROPORTIONAL TO THE SHARE OF  
3 THE REGION'S HOUSEHOLDS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THIS SLIDE SHOWS  
4 AN EXAMPLE OF HOW THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IS STRUCTURED.  
5 AND HOW THE NEW METRICS COMPLIMENTS THE INITIAL METRICS. THE  
6 QUESTION RELATED TO RHNA OBJECTIVE NUMBER FIVE IS, DOES THE  
7 ALLOCATION AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING FOR THE QUESTION  
8 THE METRICS FOCUS ON HOW ALLOCATIONS FOR THE TOP 25  
9 JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST SHARE OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE  
10 HIGHEST OR HIGH RESOURCE CENSUS TRACTS OR THE TYING  
11 OPPORTUNITY AREAS COMPARE TO THE ALLOCATIONS TO THE REST OF  
12 THE JURISDICTION IN THE REGION. INITIAL METRICS PROPOSED BY  
13 STAFF FOCUSED ON THE SHARE OF LOWER INCOME UNITS AND ASKED  
14 WHETHER THESE TOP 25 JURISDICTION RECEIVED A HIGHER PERCENTAGE  
15 NOT TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS COMPARED TO  
16 THE REST OF THE REGION. NEW COMPLIMENTARY METRIC ASKS DO THESE  
17 TOP 25 JURISDICTION RECEIVE A SHARE OF THE RHNA UNITS THAT'S  
18 AT LEAST PROPORTIONAL TO THE SHARE OF THE REGION'S EXISTING  
19 HOUSEHOLDS FOR EXAMPLE, FOR THIS METRICS IF THE GIVE  
20 JURISDICTION REPRESENT TEN PERCENT OF THE REGION'S HOUSEHOLDS  
21 THEN THEY SHOULD RECEIVE TEN PERCENT OF THE RHNA UNITS. NEXT  
22 SLIDE PLEASE. I WANTED TO HIGHLIGHT HERE THE SECOND TOPIC WE  
23 WOULD LIKE YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT TODAY IS THE PROPOSED  
24 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION METRICS. ALTHOUGH YOUR OPINION ABOUT  
25 THIS WILL BE INFORMED BY THE DETAILS OF THE PERFORMANCE

August 28, 2020

1 EVALUATION RESULTS I'LL WALK THROUGH IN THE NEXT SECTION OF  
2 THE PRESENTATION. DECISION POINT NUMBER TWO ASKED, DOES HMC  
3 RECOMMENDATION USING COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION METRICS AS  
4 DRAFTED TO ENSURE METHODOLOGY OPTIONS MEET THE STATUTORY  
5 OBJECTIVES AND ADVANCE REGIONAL POLICY GOALS? STAFF'S INITIAL  
6 RECOMMENDATION IS TO USE THE COMPREHENSIVE SET OF METRICS  
7 BECAUSE THEY PROVIDE GREATER INSIGHT IN TOTAL ALLOCATION AND  
8 ALLOCATIONS BY INCOME. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. NOW TURNING TO A  
9 SUMMARY OF HOW THE SIX METHODOLOGY OPTIONS PERFORMED USING THE  
10 EXPANDED SET OF METRICS, OVERALL ALL OF THE METHODOLOGY  
11 OPTIONS PROPOSED BY STAFF APPEAR TO FURTHER THE STATUTORY  
12 OBJECTIVE. THIS IS TRUE REGARDLESS OF HOW THE MODERATE INCOME  
13 UNITS ARE GROUPED. WHEN LOOKING AT THE INITIAL SET OF METRICS  
14 THAT FOCUS ON THE PERCENTAGE OF LOWER INCOME UNITS, OPTION  
15 ONE, THE JOBS EMPHASIS PERFORMS STRONGLY HOWEVER THIS OPTION  
16 DID NOT PERFORM AS WELL ON COMPLIMENTARY METRICS THAT FOCUS ON  
17 TOTAL UNIT ALLOCATIONS OPTION THREE OPPORTUNITY METRICS  
18 RELATED TO TOTAL ALLOCATIONS FOR ALL METHODOLOGIES THE VERSION  
19 B OPTION FOR MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE USING SAME FACTORS AS  
20 LOWER INCOME UNITS PERFORMANCE BETTER ON THE METRICS THAT  
21 INVEST ON TOTAL ALLOCATIONS I'M GOING TO WALK THROUGH THE  
22 EVALUATION RESULT IN MORE DETAIL. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO THE  
23 METRICS FOR OBJECTIVE ONE RESPOND TO THE QUESTION, DOES THE  
24 ALLOCATION INCREASE THE HOUSING SUPPLY AND THE MIX OF HOUSING  
25 TYPES, TENURE AND AFFORDABILITY IN ALL CITIES AND COUNTIES

August 28, 2020

1 WITHIN THE REGION IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER? THE METRICS FOR THIS  
2 OBJECTIVE FOCUS ON HOW THE ALLOCATIONS FOR THE 25 JURISDICTION  
3 WITH THE MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSING COST COMPARE TO THOSE FOR THE  
4 REST OF THE JURISDICTION IN THE REGION. THIS OBJECTIVE  
5 INCLUDES BOTH THE METRICS THAT LOOKS AT THE PERCENTAGE OF  
6 LOWER INCOME RHNA WHICH IS METRICS 1A.1 SHOWN ON THE LEFT AND  
7 A COMPLIMENTARY METRICS THAT LOOKS LIKE WHETHER THE TOP 25  
8 JURISDICTION SHARE A RHNA UNIT ARE PROPORTIONAL TO THE SHARE  
9 OF THE RHNA'S HOUSEHOLDS METRICS A 1.2 SHOWN ON THE RIGHT. BAR  
10 GRAPHS ARE SHOWN WHERE MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE GROUPED WITH  
11 ABOVE MODERATE INCOME UNITS THREE GRAPHS ON THE BOTTOM SHOW  
12 VERSION B FOR EACH METHODOLOGY WHERE MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE  
13 GROUPED WITH LOWER INCOME UNITS. AN IMPORTANT THING TO NOTE IS  
14 THAT THE METHODOLOGY OPTIONS ARE LISTED IN DESCENDING ORDER.  
15 SO OPTION THREE IS ON THE TOP IN EACH SECTION AND OPTION ONE  
16 IS ON THE BOTTOM. SO TURNING NOW TO THE RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE  
17 ONE. METRIC 1A.1 JURISDICTIONS WITH THE MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSE  
18 COST RECEIVE A SPECIFIC PERCENTAGE EVER RHNA AS LOWER INCOME  
19 UNITS? THE RESULT IN THE CHART ON THE LEFT SHOW THAT ALL  
20 OPTIONS PERFORM WELL, BUT OPTION 1A AND OPTION 2A PERFORM  
21 BETTER WITH THE JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSING  
22 COST RECEIVING ABOUT HALF OF THEIR RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS.  
23 METRIC 1A.2 ASKS DO JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST HOUSING COST  
24 RECEIVE A SHARE OF THE HOUSING NEEDS AT LEAST PROPORTION AT TO  
25 SHARE OF REGION'S HOUSE HOW OLDS THE RESULT SHOWN IN THE CHART

August 28, 2020

1 ON THE RIGHT SHOW OPTIONS 3B AND 3A PERFORM BEST WITH OPTION B  
2 PROVIDING MOST FOR JURISDICTION WITH ALLOCATION THAT IS 20  
3 PERCENT GREATER THAN THE SHARE OF THE REGION'S HOUSEHOLD. ON  
4 THE TOP METRICS ON THE RIGHT OPTION ONE IS THE LEAST  
5 SUCCESSFUL SINCE AS YOU CAN SEE IT FALLS SHORT OF THE DOTTED  
6 LINE INDICATING WHERE THE SHARE OF RHNA UNITS IS PROPORTIONAL  
7 TO THE SHARE OF EXISTING HOUSEHOLDS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. IN THE  
8 METRICS FOR OBJECTIVE TWO ADDRESSING THE QUESTION DOES THE  
9 ALLOCATION PROMOTE INFILL DEVELOPMENT IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC EQUITY  
10 PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AGRICULTURE RESOURCES EFFICIENT  
11 DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE REGION'S  
12 GREENHOUSE GAS YOU REDUCTION TARGETS? THERE ARE THREE METRICS  
13 FOR THIS OBJECTIVE AND THEY ALL MEASURE THE AVERAGE GROWTH  
14 RATE RESULTING FROM RHNA. THERE ARE NO NEW COMPLIMENTARY  
15 METRICS FOR THIS OBJECTIVE AS THESE METRICS DON'T FOCUS ON THE  
16 PERCENTAGE OF LOWER INCOME UNITS RECEIVED BY JURISDICTION. TO  
17 ADDRESS THE ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED IN OBJECTIVE TWO, THE THREE  
18 METRICS LOOK AT WHETHER RHNA UNITS ARE ALLOCATED TO THE  
19 JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST JOBS, THE MOST ACCESS TO TRANSIT,  
20 AND THE LOWEST VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED. METRICS 2A ASKS DO  
21 JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST SHARE OF THE REGION'S JOBS HAVE  
22 HIGHEST GROWTH RATES RESULTING FROM THE RHNA? YOU CAN SEE THAT  
23 ALL OPTIONS PERFORM STRONGLY, BUT OPTION 1A RESULT IN THE 25  
24 JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST JOBS RECEIVING THE HIGHEST GROWTH  
25 RATES FROM THE RHNA ALLOCATIONS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE SECOND

**August 28, 2020**

1 METRIC FOR OBJECTIVE TWO ASKS, DO JURISDICTION WITH THE  
2 LARGEST SHARE OF THE REGION'S ACRES IN TRANSIT PRIORITY AREAS  
3 HAVE THE HIGHEST GROWTH RATES RESULTING FROM RHNA? METRIC 2B  
4 HAS SIMILAR RESULTS. WITH OPTION A RESULTING IN 25  
5 JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST ACRES NEAREST TRANSIT EXPERIENCING  
6 THE HIGHEST AVERAGE GROWTH RATE COMPARED TO THE OTHER  
7 METHODOLOGIES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE LAST OBJECTIVE -- THE  
8 LAST METRIC FOR OBJECTIVE TWO ASKS DO JURISDICTION WITH THE  
9 LOWEST VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED OR VMT PER RESIDENT HAVE THE  
10 HIGHEST GROWTH RATE RESULTING FROM RHNA 1A PERFORMANCE BEST ON  
11 THE METRIC SIMILAR TO THE OPTIONS ON THE OBJECTIVE. ALL  
12 OPTIONS ARE RELATIVELY SUCCESSFUL AT FURTHERING THE OBJECTIVE  
13 SINCE THE GROUP OF TOP 25 JURISDICTION CONSISTENTLY EXPERIENCE  
14 HIGHER GROWTH RATES THAN THE REST OF THE JURISDICTION IN THE  
15 REGION. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE METRICS FOR OBJECTIVE THREE  
16 ADDRESS THE QUESTION DOES THE ALLOCATION PROMOTE AN IMPROVED  
17 INTRAREGIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOBS AND HOUSING? INCLUDING  
18 AN IMPROVED BALANCE BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF LOW WAGE JOBS AND  
19 THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS AFFORDABLE TO LOW-WAGE WORKERS IN  
20 EACH JURISDICTION. METRICS FOR THIS OBJECTIVE SPECIFICALLY  
21 FOCUS ON ALLOCATING RHNA UNITS TO THE 25 JURISDICTION WITH THE  
22 LEAST BALANCED JOBS/HOUSING FIT. METRICS 3A WORN ASKS DO  
23 JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST LOWEST WAGeworkERS WITH THE HOUSING  
24 UNITS AFFORDABLE TO LOW-WAGE WORKERS SPECIFIC TO THE -- AS  
25 LOWER INCOME UNITS CHART ON THE LEFT INDICATE THAT ALL OPTIONS

August 28, 2020

1 PERFORM WELL BUT OPTION 1A AND 2A ALLOCATE THE LARGEST SHARES  
2 OF LOWER INCOME UNITS TO JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST UNBALANCED  
3 JOBS/HOUSING FIT. METRIC 3A.2 ASKS DO THE JURISDICTION WITH  
4 THE MOST LOW WAGERS RECEIVE A SHARE OF THE REGION'S HOUSING  
5 NEED THAT'S AT LEAST PROPORTIONAL TO THE SHARE OF THE REGION'S  
6 HOUSEHOLDS. THE RESULTS OF THE COMPLIMENTARY METRIC SHOWN IN  
7 THE CHARTS ON THE RIGHT INDICATE THAT ALL OPTIONS PERFORM WELL  
8 BUT OPTION THREE ASSIGNS JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST UNBALANCED  
9 JOBS/HOUSING FIT LARGER TOTAL ALLOCATIONS THAN THEY RECEIVE  
10 FROM THE OTHER METHODOLOGY OPTIONS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE  
11 METRICS FOR OBJECTIVE FOUR RESPOND TO THE QUESTION, DOES THE  
12 ALLOCATION DIRECT A LOWER PROPORTION OF HOUSING NEEDS TO AN  
13 INCOME CATEGORY WHEN A JURISDICTION ALREADY HAS A  
14 DISPROPORTIONATE HIGH SHARE OF HOUSEHOLD IN THAT CATEGORY.  
15 METRIC FOUR ASKS DO JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE  
16 EVER HIGH INCOME RESIDENTS RECEIVE A LARGER SHARE OF THEIR  
17 RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS THAN JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST  
18 PERCENTAGE EVER LOW INCOME RESIDENTS? THE RESULTS SHOW THAT  
19 EVERY METHODOLOGY GIVES JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST  
20 PERCENTAGE EVER ARE HIGH INCOME RESIDENTS A LARGER SHARE OF  
21 THEIR RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS THAN JURISDICTION WITH THE  
22 LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF LOW INCOME RESIDENTS. HOWEVER OPTION 1A  
23 AND OPTION 2A ALLOCATE DISPROPORTIONATE HIGH INCOME  
24 JURISDICTION. LARGEST SHARES OF LOWER INCOME UNITS RESULTING  
25 IN THESE JURISDICTION RECEIVING MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF THEIR

August 28, 2020

1 RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE METRICS FOR  
2 OBJECTIVE FIVE RESPOND TO THE QUESTION: DOES THE ALLOCATION  
3 AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING? THERE ARE THREE METRICS  
4 FOR THIS OBJECTIVE. FOCUS ON ALLOCATIONS TO JURISDICTION WITH  
5 THE MOST ACCESS TO RESOURCES, THOSE EXHIBITING THE MOST RACIAL  
6 AND ECONOMIC EXCLUSION, AND THOSE WITH THE DISPROPORTIONATE  
7 SHARES OF HIGH INCOME HOUSEHOLDS. METRIC 5A ONE ASKS DO  
8 JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS LIVING  
9 IN HIGH OR HIGHEST RESOURCE CENSUS TRACTS OR BOTH HIGH  
10 OPPORTUNITY AREAS RECEIVE A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF THEIR  
11 RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS? THE RESULTS SHOWN IN THE CHART ON  
12 THE LEFT INDICATE THAT ALL OPTIONS PERFORMED STRONGLY. OPTION  
13 1A AND OPTION 2A ALLOCATE THE LARGEST SHARES OF AFFORDABLE  
14 UNITS TO THE 25 JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST PERCENTAGES OF  
15 HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN THE HIGH OR HIGHEST RESOURCE CENSUS  
16 TRACTS WITH BOTH METHODOLOGIES ASSIGNING THESE JURISDICTION  
17 MORE THAN HALF OF THE RHNA AS LOW INCOME UNITS. METRIC 5A TWO  
18 ASKS DO JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS  
19 LIVING IN HIGH HIGHER HIGHEST RESOURCE TRACT RECEIVE A SHARE  
20 OF THE HOUSING NEEDS AT LEAST PROPORTIONAL TO THE SHARE OF THE  
21 REGION'S HOUSEHOLDS? FOR THIS METRIC OPTION 3B PERFORMS BEST  
22 AS SHOWN IN THE CHARTS ON THE RIGHT. ALTHOUGH OPTION 1A  
23 PERFORMED WELL ON METRIC SIDE A ONE REGARDING A PERCENTAGE OF  
24 RHNA AS LOWER INCOME UNITS IT DOES NOT ALLOCATE A SHARE OF THE  
25 RHNA PROPORTIONAL TO THE JURISDICTION'S SHARE OF TOTAL

August 28, 2020

1 HOUSEHOLDS TO THOSE JURISDICTION WITH THE MOST ACCESS TO  
2 RESOURCES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE SECOND METRIC FOR OBJECTIVE  
3 FIVE ASKS, DO RACIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION  
4 RECEIVE A SHARE OF THE REGION'S HOUSING NEEDS AT LEAST  
5 PROPORTION AT TO THE SHARE OF HOUSEHOLDS? SIMILAR TO THE  
6 RESULTS OF METRIC 5A.2 OPTION 3B PERFORMS BEST IN ALLOCATING  
7 JURISDICTION WITHIN ABOVE AVERAGE DIVERGENCE SCORE AND  
8 PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS OF 25 PERCENT ABOVE MEDIAN INCOME THE  
9 LARGEST ALLOCATIONS RESULT TO SHARE OF REGION'S HOUSEHOLDS  
10 ONCE AGAIN OPTION 1A DOES NOT ALLOCATE RHNA UNITS PROPORTIONAL  
11 TO A JURISDICTION'S SHARE OF EXISTING HOUSEHOLDS. NEXT SLIDE  
12 PLEASE. THE LAST METRIC FOR OBJECTIVE FIVE ASKS DO  
13 JURISDICTION WITH THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF HIGH INCOME  
14 RESIDENTS RECEIVE A SHARE ASSIST -- OF THE REGION'S HOUSING  
15 NEED PROPORTIONAL TO SHARE OF HOUSEHOLDS SIMILAR TO OTHER  
16 METHODS OF THE OBJECTIVE OPTION 3B PERFORMS BEST AND OPTION 1A  
17 DOES NOT PARTICULARLY PERFORM WELL. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO A  
18 LAST DECISION POINT THAT WE WOULD LIKE YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT  
19 TODAY IS WHICH OF THE SIX METHODOLOGY OPTIONS SHOULD WE FOCUS  
20 ON IN OUR REMAINING DISCUSSIONS. DECISION POINT 3 ASKS WHICH  
21 OF THE SIX METHODOLOGIES DOES HMC RECOMMEND TO CONTINUING TO  
22 CONSIDER AS PERFORMING BEST IN MEETING THE RHNA STATUTORY  
23 OBJECTIVES AND PRODUCING THE BEST OUTCOMES FOR THE REGION. AS  
24 WE NOTICED THROUGHOUT THE DISCUSSION OF THE PERFORMANCE  
25 EVALUATION RESULTS ALL OF THE SIX OPTIONS APPEAR TO FURTHER

**August 28, 2020**

1 THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVE. THERE ARE SOME VARIATIONS IN WHICH  
2 OPTIONS PERFORM BEST ON DIFFERENT METRICS WITH OPTION 1A IN  
3 PARTICULAR DOING WELL ON MEASURES RELATED TO THE PERCENTAGE OF  
4 LOWER INCOME UNITS, AND ON METRICS RELATED TO OBJECTIVE TWO,  
5 PROMOTING INFILL, EFFICIENT DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS AND  
6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS. AT THE SAME TIME OPTION  
7 3B GENERALLY DOES BEST ON THE METRICS RELATED TO ALLOCATING  
8 JURISDICTION A SHARE EVER RHNA UNITS THAT PROPORTIONAL TO  
9 SHARE OF EXISTING HOUSEHOLDS. IN ADDITION TO THE PERFORMANCE  
10 EVALUATION METRICS HMC MEMBERS CAN CONSIDER THE PATTERN OF  
11 HOUSING GROWTH REPRESENTED BY THE ALLOCATIONS AS WELL AS THE  
12 PRINCIPLES OR POLICY OBJECTIVES REPRESENTED BY THE FACTORS AND  
13 WEIGHTS IN THE METHODOLOGY. AND HOW THOSE SUPPORT A COMPELLING  
14 NARRATIVE ABOUT HOW RHNA ADDRESSING THE BAY AREA'S HOUSING  
15 CHALLENGES. STAFF IS TRYING TO HIGHLIGHT THE WAY IN WHICH THE  
16 METHODOLOGY OPTIONS APPEAR TO PERFORM BETTER THAN OTHERS BUT  
17 IT STOPS SHORT OF RECOMMENDING A PARTICULAR METHODOLOGY. IN  
18 DEFERENCE TO THE HMC'S ROLE IN CHOOSING THE METHODOLOGY THAT  
19 FIND THE RIGHT BALANCE IN ACHIEVING DIFFERENT POLICY OUTCOMES  
20 EMBODIED IN THE RHNA STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND IN MEETING  
21 REGIONAL PLANNING GOALS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO LASTLY JUST A  
22 REMINDER, AT THE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 18TH, IT'S THE LAST  
23 MEETING OF THE HMC, AND YOU WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY AT THAT  
24 MEETING TO VOTE ON A PROPOSED METHODOLOGY TO RECOMMEND TO THE

**August 28, 2020**

1 ABAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE ABAG EXECUTIVE BOARD.  
2 AND WITH THAT, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO TAKE CLARIFYING QUESTIONS.

3

4 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AMBER, ARE YOU  
5 GOING TO FACILITATE OF THE DISCUSSION THIS ITEM?

6

7 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** SURE THING. I SO I THINK BECAUSE WE HAVE SO  
8 MUCH TO COVER TODAY WE'RE GOING TO START WITH THE QUESTION  
9 AROUND MODERATE INCOME GROUPEd. SO IDEALLY, WE TAKE A BREAK  
10 FOR TEN MINUTES AT 10:30 SO WE HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF TIME TO  
11 GET THROUGH THAT, AND THE FASTER WE CAN GET THROUGH THAT, THE  
12 QUICKER WE CAN GET TO TALKING ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY GILLIAN  
13 SHARED. SO LET'S START WITH CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AROUND THE  
14 MODERATE INCOME GROUPING CONVERSATION. ANYONE HAVE ANY  
15 QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRESENTATION OR WHAT GILLIAN SHARED? YOU  
16 CAN USE THE LITTLE RAISE YOUR HAND FUNCTION. AND WE'LL TAKE  
17 QUESTIONS ON THAT. NIECE A I SEE YOU HAVE YOUR HAND RAISED.  
18 START US OFF.

19

20 **NEYSA FLIGOR:** THANKS FOR THE PRESENTATION GILLIAN. ON THE  
21 MODERATE INCOME UNITS QUESTION. I'M LOOKING AT MY NOTES ABOUT  
22 ASKING THE QUESTION. DID I HEAR YOU CORRECTLY THAT IF WE WERE  
23 TO ALLOCATE MODERATE INCOME UNITS THE SAME WAY WE ALLOCATE LOW  
24 INCOME UNITS THAT IN ADDITION ENCOURAGING AND INCREASING THE  
25 DEVELOPMENT OF MODERATE INCOME UNITS IT WOULD ALSO INCREASE

August 28, 2020

1 THE RHNA UNITS ASSIGNED TO EACH JURISDICTION? AND I'M TRYING  
2 TO UNDERSTAND THAT SECOND PART, GILLIAN, WHY WOULD IT INCREASE  
3 A JURISDICTION'S RHNA ALLOCATION NUMBER? BECAUSE IT'S GREAT. I  
4 LIKE WHERE WE'RE GOING WITH THIS, WE'RE -- IT WOULD ENCOURAGE  
5 THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORE MIDDLE, YOU KNOW, MODERATE INCOME  
6 HOUSING, BUT WHY WOULD IT ALSO INCREASE A JURISDICTION'S RHNA  
7 NUMBERS?

8

9 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** SO LET ME CLARIFY THAT. SO THERE IS A FIXED  
10 NUMBER OF MODERATE INCOME UNITS THAT WE HAVE BEEN ASSIGNED BY  
11 HCD AS PART OF THE RHNA NUMBER DETERMINATION. WHAT THIS WOULD  
12 DO IS REDISTRIBUTE THOSE UNITS. AND I GUESS THE POINT I WAS  
13 TRYING TO MAKE IS IT DOES NOT -- REDISTRIBUTING THOSE MODERATE  
14 INCOME UNITS BECAUSE WE'RE USING DIFFERENT FACTORS FOR HOW WE  
15 ALLOCATE THEM THE OPTION VERSION A WHERE WE ALLOCATE THEM WITH  
16 THE MOD -- THE ABOVE MODERATE INCOME UNITS WOULD DIRECT THEM,  
17 USING DIFFERENT FACTORS, AND IF WE USE VERSION B WHERE WE  
18 ALLOCATE THEM USING THE SAME FACTORS AS LOWER INCOME. SO THEY  
19 WOULD END UP IN DIFFERENT PLACES THROUGHOUT THE REGION. AND  
20 FOR THOSE PLACES, WHERE WOULD THEY GET REDIRECTED, THEIR  
21 ALLOCATION OF MODERATE INCOME UNITS GOES UP, AND THEN BY  
22 DEFINITION, THEIR TOTAL ALLOCATION WILL GO UP. BUT IT'S NOT  
23 INCREASING THE NUMBER OF MODERATE INCOME UNITS THAT WERE  
24 ALLOCATING REGION WIDE. THAT'S FIXED. IS THAT ANSWERING YOUR  
25 QUESTION?

August 28, 2020

1

2 **NEYSA FLIGOR:** IT DOES. I GUESS WHAT I'M NOT UNDERSTANDING IS -  
3 - AND I UNDERSTAND WHERE THERE ARE MODERATE NUMBER OF INCOME  
4 UNITS WOULD GO UP BUT WOULD IT BE OFFSET BY THEIR NUMBERS FOR  
5 LOWER INCOME UNITS? DO YOU KNOW WHAT I'M SAYING? THE TOTAL  
6 NUMBER SHOULD BE THE SAME FOR THE JURISDICTION IT'S JUST FOR  
7 THAT MODERATE INCOME BUCKET IT WOULD BE A HIGHER ALLOCATION.

8

9 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** SOY BECAUSE WE'RE ALLOCATING EACH -- IN THE --  
10 EXCUSE ME -- EACH INCOME CATEGORY INDEPENDENTLY, IT DOES NOT  
11 CHANGE HOW THE UNIT IN OTHER INCOME CATEGORIES ARE ALLOCATED.  
12 SO, IT'S IN ADDITION YOUR VERY LOW AND LOW. NOT REPLACING ANY  
13 OF THAT.

14

15 **NEYSA FLIGOR:** GOT IT. SO THOSE WOULD STAY STATIC. AND THEN --  
16 GOT IT. THANK YOU.

17

18 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** GREAT.

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANK YOU. NELL.

21

22 **NELL SELANDER:** I'M NOT SURE THIS IS MODERATE INCOME CATEGORY  
23 BUT IN THE CALCULATIONS, SO ONE OF THE PUBLIC -- THIS IS  
24 SOMETHING THAT CAME TO ME WHEN I WAS GOING THROUGH THE  
25 VISUALIZATION TOOL AND SUMMING THE TOTALS FOR SAN MATEO

August 28, 2020

1 COUNTY. AND STAFF MAT COUNTY STAFF, SO THAT'S WHAT I HAVE BEEN  
2 FOCUSING ON TO SEE HOW THESE OPTIONS PLAY OUT IN OUR COUNTY.  
3 SO, AND THEN THIS WAS RAISED BY ONE EFFORT PUBLIC COMMENT  
4 LETTERS THAT WAS SENT AROUND LATE LAST NIGHT OR THIS MORNING  
5 IT SEEMS LIKE THE RHNA ALLOCATION IS REALLY FRONT LOADING THE  
6 BLUEPRINT 2050 NUMBERS. SO I WAS WONDERING, IT SEEMS LIKE IF  
7 YOU TAKE THE 2050 PROJECTIONS, THE 2050 HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS,  
8 BY COUNTY, YOU DIVIDE IT BY 30 YEARS OR 2020 THROUGH 2050, YOU  
9 KNOW, AND THEN YOU ADD EIGHT YEARS TOGETHER FOR A RHNA CYCLE,  
10 IN SAN MATEO COUNTY THAT SHOULD BE ABOUT 36,000 UNITS. IT  
11 SEEMS LIKE WHAT WE'RE BEING ASKED TO ACHIEVE IN EIGHT YEARS IS  
12 REALLY THE 12 OR 13 YEARS OF THE PLANNED BAY AREA -- THE  
13 BLUEPRINT PLAN. INSTEAD OF AMORTIZING THOSE FIRST TWO OR THREE  
14 YEARS THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE NEXT RHNA CYCLE OVER THE 30  
15 YEAR HORIZON, IT -- I THINK THE WAY THAT'S PLAYING OUT IN SAN  
16 MATEO COUNTY, IS THAT A FEW COMMUNITIES HAVE THIS EXPONENTIAL  
17 GROWTH THAT WE CAN'T REALLY FIGURE OUT WHY THAT'S HAPPENING.  
18 SO IT JUST SEEMS LIKE MAYBE THOSE FIRST 2 TO 3 YEARS OF THE  
19 2050 BLUEPRINT ARE BEING ALL WEDGED INTO THIS FIRST RHNA CYCLE  
20 RATHER THAN AMORTIZED OVER THE WHOLE BLUEPRINT. IS THAT AT ALL  
21 ACCURATE? OR AM I MISSING, SORT OF THE MATH HERE? >DAVE  
22 VAUTIN: THIS IS DAVE VAUTIN WITH MTC ABAG STAFF. I CAN TAKE  
23 THIS QUESTION. I THINK THIS -- I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE WHAT  
24 YOU'RE REFERRING TO BUT MY INITIAL GUESS IS THAT ONE OF THE  
25 KEY DECISIONS MADE AT THE LAST HMC WAS WHETHER TO USE THE

August 28, 2020

1 GROWTH, RIGHT, OR THE 2050 HOUSEHOLDS TOTAL. SO BASED ON THAT  
2 CONSENSUS THAT WAS REACHED LAST TIME, THE BASELINE THAT YOU'RE  
3 SEEING TODAY IS REFLECTIVE NOT OF THE GROWTH OVER THE PERIOD,  
4 BUT THE TOTAL, AND SO YOU MAY SEE A HIGHER SHARE AS A RESULT  
5 OF THAT, WHEN YOU LOOK AT BOTH THE COMBINATION OF THE EXISTING  
6 HOUSEHOLDS PLUS THE GROWTH EQUALLING 2050 IN THE NUMBERS. YOU  
7 KNOW WHEN WE WERE DEVELOPING THE RHNA BASELINE NUMBERS ARE ALL  
8 FOCUSED ON EIGHT YEAR PERIOD NOT A LONGER PERIOD. THAT WOULD  
9 BE MY HUNCH BUT WE CAN LOOK INTO IT AND GET BACK TO YOU.

10

11 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. THANK YOU. PAT, IT LOOKS LIKE YOU HAVE A  
12 QUESTION.

13

14 **PAT ECKLUND:** YES. I DO. I DON'T KNOW -- THIS IS PROBABLY NOT  
15 THE RIGHT TIME, BUT THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION  
16 CHART THAT WE GOT, I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY, LIKE, FOR MARIN,  
17 SAN RAFAEL WENT DOWN ON JOBS BY 15,000, FROM 2050 TO 2050, AND  
18 PORT OF MADERA WENT DOWN BY 3,000, AND OTHER CITIES WENT UP.

19 WHY -- THAT'S A HUGE DROP FOR THOSE COMMUNITIES. WHAT -- WHAT  
20 HAPPENED? >DAVE VAUTIN: SO THANKS FOR THE QUESTION, PAT.

21 THAT'S NOT PARTICULARLY RELEVANT TO THE HMC CONVERSATION  
22 TODAY, BUT I'M HAPPY TO GIVE A QUICK ANSWER FOR IT. SO IN THE  
23 DRAFT BLUEPRINT WE DID SEE CLIENTS FOR JOBS IN SEVERAL MARIN  
24 COUNTY CITIES WE BELIEVE THIS IS DUE TO A REFLECTION OF A FEW  
25 DIFFERENT TRENDS IN MARIN. IT'S ALREADY THE OLDEST COUNTY IN

August 28, 2020

1 TERMS OF MEDIAN AGE AND THAT TREND IS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE  
2 INTO THE FUTURE. SO THERE IS A GREATER SHARE OF RETIREES IN  
3 MARIN COUNTY WHICH CONTRIBUTES TO THE JOB DECLINES. ALSO AS WE  
4 LOOK FORWARD IT'S A COUNTY WITH MORE LIMITED GROWTH SO THAT  
5 MEANS THAT THE, YOU KNOW, WITH THE DECLINE OF RETAIL, AND THE  
6 IN GROWING USE OF E-COMMERCE WE'RE SEEING REDUCTION IN THAT  
7 SECTOR AS WELL. THERE ARE A FEW DIFFERENT TRENDS AT PLAY THERE  
8 BUT IT'S MORE PERTINENT TO THE PLANNED BAY AREA 2050  
9 CONVERSATION WHICH IS AT THE COUNTY AND SUBCOUNTY LEVELS.

10

11 **PAT ECKLUND:** THANK YOU.

12

13 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** GREAT. THANKS. ELISE THEN JAMES.

14

15 **SPEAKER:** I HAVE A COMMENT. LETTER FROM PIEDMONT LEADS THAT  
16 EXAMPLE. I THINK THE HOUSEHOLD GROWTH FOR THE PLANNED BAY AREA  
17 THE BLUEPRINT IS NOTHING FOR HOUSEHOLD GROWTH AND YET THEY'RE  
18 EXPERIENCING LIKE A 1,000 PERCENT INCREASE OVER RHNA AND ALSO  
19 A HUGE INCREASE -- WELL, FOR THEM -- IN HOUSING UNITS, AND I  
20 HAVE SEEN THAT FOR SOME OTHER COMMUNITIES TOO, SO I THINK IT'S  
21 SOMETHING WE SHOULD LOOK AT BUT WHAT MAKES ME CONCERNED ABOUT  
22 THAT IS NOT SO MUCH THE RHNA, WHICH, IS ONE FACTOR BUT ALSO  
23 HOW DOES PLANNED BAY AREA 2050 PLAY OUT IF THE RHNA IS NOT  
24 CONSISTENT WITH PLANNED BAY AREA? ESPECIALLY WHAT ARE THE  
25 CLIMATE IMPACTS IF OUR HOUSING IS BEING DIRECTED TO

August 28, 2020

1 COMMUNITIES THAT WE'RE NOT PLANNING FOR OR ARE NOT AT THE SAME  
2 LEVEL IN PLANNED BAY AREA? IS IT GOING TO RESULT IN MORE  
3 IMPACTS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION AND CLIMATE IMPACT SIDE THAN  
4 WHAT WE'RE ANTICIPATING BASED ON THE NUMBERS WE'RE LOOKING AT  
5 FOR THIS RHNA AND THAT WAS JUST MY COMMENT. AND ALSO I HAD THE  
6 SAME QUESTION ABOUT THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS WHY THEY'RE  
7 RAISING THE OVERALL LEVEL AND I WAS JUST WONDERING, I STILL  
8 DON'T QUITE UNDERSTAND WHY THERE CAN'T BE AN ADJUSTMENT THAT  
9 TAKES CARE OF THAT. LIKE, MAYBE SOMEONE'S HIGH INCOME HOUSING  
10 GOES DOWN. I GUESS I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY IT HAS TO  
11 INCREASE EITHER.

12

13 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** I CAN ANSWER THE QUESTION ABOUT THE INCOME  
14 REGROUPING. SO ESSENTIALLY THE WAY THE CHANGE IS WORKING IS WE  
15 HAVE AN EXISTING SET OF FACTORS THAT ARE ALLOCATING VERY LOW  
16 AND LOW INCOME UNITS AND WHEN WE CHOOSE TO ALLOCATE -- SO  
17 THOSE ARE SORT OF ESSENTIALLY SETTING A JURISDICTION'S TOTAL  
18 NUMBER OF UNITS IN THE VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME CATEGORIES.  
19 WHEN WE SHIFT THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS TO BE ALLOCATED BY A  
20 DIFFERENT SET OF FACTORS THEN THOSE -- EVERYTHING ELSE SORT OF  
21 STAYS THE SAME, AND THOSE FACTORS ARE USED TO ALLOCATE  
22 MODERATE INCOME UNITS AND SO IF YOU ARE A JURISDICTION THAT,  
23 BECAUSE OF THOSE FACTORS, BECAUSE YOU'RE USING A DIFFERENT SET  
24 OF FACTORS, IS GOING TO RECEIVE ADDITIONAL UNITS THAN ITS  
25 ADDITIONAL TO WHAT YOU ALREADY HAD. I GUESS THE ANSWER IS, SO

August 28, 2020

1 THERE IS TWO OPTIONS ON THE TABLE. ONE IS MAINTAIN MODERATE  
2 INCOME UNITS AND HAVE THEM ALLOCATED ALONG WITH ABOVE MODERATE  
3 UNITS. THAT WAS SORT OF THE ORIGINAL WAY THE BOTTOM-UP  
4 METHODOLOGY WAS STRUCTURED. WHAT THIS WAS PROPOSING IS TO MAKE  
5 A CHANGE TO THAT AND ONE EFFECT OF THAT CHANGE IS LEADING TO  
6 AN INCREASE IN THE TOTAL ALLOCATIONS TO A JURISDICTION THAT  
7 END UP HAVING A HIGHER NUMBER OF MODERATE INCOME HOUSING  
8 UNITS.

9

10 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** NAME THEN NOAH?

11

12 **JAMES PAPPAS:** THANKS. I HAVE BEEN THINKING ABOUT THE MOD HAT  
13 INCOME QUESTION FOR THE LAST FEW WEEKS AND IN GENERAL, I  
14 CERTAINLY AGREE THAT, YOU KNOW, MODERATE INCOME FOAMS -- FOLKS  
15 HAVE BEEN FACING EXCLUSION AND FACING SOME OF THE SAME  
16 CHALLENGES AS LOW INCOME FOLKS IN FACING HOUSING QUESTIONS IN  
17 THE BAY AREA. BUT I THINK THE THING I HAVE BEEN STRUGGLING  
18 WITH, AND THINKING ABOUT SOME OF THE COMMENTS FROM LAST WEEK  
19 IS THAT IT FEELS LIKE MOST OF OUR TOOLS TO PRODUCE MODERATE  
20 INCOME HOUSING ARE ACTUALLY MORE MARKET BASED WHETHER AD US,  
21 WHICH ARE COUNTED AS MODERATE INCOME, INCLUSIONARY WHICH  
22 DEPENDS ON THE PRODUCTION OF ABOVE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING  
23 LAST TIME CERTAINLY IN SAN FRANCISCO THAT'S THE CASE ALL OF  
24 OUR NEW MODERATE MECHANIC HOUSING IS EITHER INCLUSIONARY OR  
25 ADUS, AND THEN I ALSO HEARD SOMEONE COMMENT, WHICH I THINK IS

August 28, 2020

1 SOMETHING THAT WE EXPERIENCES IN SAN FRANCISCO WHICH IS THAT  
2 SOMETIMES MODERATE INCOME RENT AT 1020 PERCENT OF AMI COULD BE  
3 SIMILAR TO MARKET RENTS IN PART OF THE CITY. AND I THINK THAT  
4 COULD BE TRUE IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE REGION. ANYWAY, I JUST  
5 WANTED TO HEAR AGAIN FROM FOLKS WHO ARE ADVOCATING FOR THIS  
6 CHANGE, WHY THEY THINK THAT'S GOING TO GET MORE MODERATE  
7 INCOME HOUSING? OR IS IT BETTER TO BUNDLE MODERATE INCOME  
8 HOUSING WITH ABOVE MODERATE SINCE THAT IS MORE THE TOOL THAT  
9 WE'RE USING TO ADDRESS MODERATE INCOME NEEDS? AND I SHOULD ADD  
10 THAT, YOU KNOW, CERTAINLY IN SAN FRANCISCO WHERE WE PROBABLY  
11 INVEST AS MUCH AS ANY OTHER CITY OR MORE, IN AFFORDABLE  
12 HOUSING, WE DIRECTION THAT TO MOSTLY VERY LOW, SUPPORTIVE  
13 HOUSING, AND LOW INCOME AND I DON'T SEE A MOMENT WHERE WE  
14 SHIFT A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF THOSE RESOURCES TO MODERATE  
15 INCOME. SO STILL DON'T SEE MODERATE INCOME BEING PRODUCED IN  
16 THE SAME WAY THAT VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME HOUSING IS BEING  
17 PRODUCED.

18

19 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS JAMES. YOU'RE ASKING IF SOMEONE CAN  
20 SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THIS SHIFT. NOAH I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S  
21 WHAT YOU WERE GOING TAKE ON WITH YOUR HAND RAISED. I SEE A  
22 COUPLE OF OTHER HANDS. NOAH DO YOU WANT TO GO NEXT? THEN AARTI  
23 AND FERNANDO.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** THANK YOU VERY MUCH. COTATI. I AM SUPPORTING MODERATE  
2 INCOME UNITS AS A COMPONENT OF THE BLOW MARKET RATE ALLOCATION  
3 SAYS. AS A CITY WE CATEGORIZE THOSE UNITS TOGETHER ALREADY SO  
4 WHEN WE LOOK AT OUR INCLUSIONARY PROCESSES WHEN WE LOOK AT OUR  
5 INCOME MIX THAT WE REQUIRE FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS  
6 THOSE ARE INCLUDED IN THAT CALCULATION. SO JUST FROM A KIND OF  
7 A CITY CENTRIC PERSPECTIVE THEY HAVE, IT MAKES SENSE, GIVEN  
8 THAT THEY DO MEET THE CATEGORY REQUIREMENTS, AND THEN  
9 INDIVIDUAL CITIES ALLOCATE WHATEVER INCOME MIX THEY NEED BASED  
10 ON THEIR INCLUSIONARY REG REGULATIONS. AS STAFF POINTED OUT IN  
11 THEIR PRESENTATION, AND FINALLY ONE OF THE THINGS WE DID  
12 PRIORITIZE BACK IN OUR MARCH MEETING WAS PUTTING MORE HOUSING  
13 UNITS IN GENERAL, AND MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS IN GENERAL  
14 CLOSE TO THESE HIGH RESOURCE AREAS SO IF THAT'S GOING TO BE  
15 THE CASE GROUPED THESE TOGETHER SEEMS LIKE IT WILL PROVIDE A  
16 LITTLE BIT OF RELIEF TO THOSE COMMUNITIES TO HAVE A BROAD  
17 RANGE OF INCOME CATEGORIES TO BE ABLE TO INCLUDE IN THAT  
18 INCREASED ALLOCATION OF BMR UNITS. SO THAT'S MY COMMENT.

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS NO AARTI.

21

22 **AARTI SHRIVASTAVA:** HELLO I'M LOOKING AT THE FACTORS THAT WE  
23 ARE USING TO ALLOCATE THESE UNITS AND IT APPEARS TO ME THAT  
24 THE MODERATE INCOME CATEGORY HAS MORE IN COMMON WITH THE ABOVE  
25 MODERATE IN TERMS OF JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE, JOBS PROXIMITY TO

August 28, 2020

1 TRANSIT JOBS PROXIMITY TO AUTO RATHER THAN JOBS/HOUSING FIT.  
2 ADDITIONALLY WE TALKED ABOUT COMMUNITIES THAT COULD EXPERIENCE  
3 DISPLACEMENT BY GETTING A HIGHER SHARE OF MODERATE INCOME  
4 UNITS, AND I THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE A CONCERN AS WELL. AND  
5 BECAUSE OF THAT, I AM MORE INCLINED TO LUMP THE MODERATE AND  
6 ABOVE MODERATE TOGETHER. I DO NOTE THAT IT DOESN'T MOVE THE  
7 NEEDLE A WHOLE LOT, AND SO I DON'T -- I DON'T THINK GOING  
8 EITHER WAY IS GOING TO CREATE THIS HUGE SHIFT. BUT IT APPEARS  
9 TO ME THAT THE FACTORS YOU'RE USING TO ALLOCATE MODERATE  
10 INCOME HOUSING ARE MORE SUITED TO THE ONES THAT WE'RE USING  
11 FOR ABOVE MODERATE.

12

13 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS. ELLEN.

14

15 **ELLEN CLARK:** I WANT TO ECHO THE POINTS MADE BY AARTI.  
16 CONCEPTUALLY TO ME, I THINK THOSE UNITS ARE IT'S SO VARIABLE  
17 FROM PLACE TO PLACE BASED ON WHICH CATEGORY THEY FALL INTO  
18 BASED ON MARKET AND IN SOME PLACES MARKET MADE PACKETS OF  
19 MODERATE UNITS. NOT TRUE EVERYWHERE. BUT I THINK IT'S TRUE TO  
20 THE TOOL AND WOULD SUPPORT TO CONTINUING TO BUMP THEM WITH THE  
21 ABOVE MODERATE UNITS.

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS FERNANDO AND VICTORIA.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **FERNANDO MARTI:** I THINK AS SOMEBODY WHO GROUPED THE UNITS.  
2 NEEDLE DOESN'T MOVE THAT MUCH SO I DON'T NECESSARILY FEEL  
3 QUITE AS STRONGLY AS I DID BEFORE ABOUT THAT GROUPING. THAT  
4 SAID, I THINK IN CITIES LIKE SAN FRANCISCO AND JAMES, WHAT I  
5 HAVE DONE IS LOOKED AT NEW CONSTRUCTION, SALES PRICES AND  
6 RENTAL PRICES, AND SOME OF THE STOOD UNITS COME OUT AT --  
7 THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT OCEAN AVENUE FOR EXAMPLE, -- MODERATE  
8 INCOME PRETTY MUCH ANYTHING THAT IS A ONE BEDROOM, TWO  
9 BEDROOM, THREE BEDROOM ANYWHERE IN THE CITY FALLS OUTSIDE OF  
10 THAT SO THERE IS VERY LITTLE THAT IS FOR THE MARKET PROVIDING  
11 MODERATE INCOME IN CITIES LIKE SAN FRANCISCO. THIS IS TOTALLY  
12 DIFFERENT. THAT'S WHY I DON'T FEEL AS STRONGLY ABOUT THIS  
13 BECAUSE SOME OF THIS MIGHT PLAY OUT VERY DIFFERENT IN OTHER  
14 PLACES. I THINK THE OTHER SIDE OF IT IS THAT WE ARE NOW  
15 SEEING, FOR EXAMPLE, THE STATE NOW HAS AN EXPANDED TAX CREDIT  
16 PROGRAM DIRECTLY LINKED TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR MODERATE  
17 INCOME. I THINK IT PUTS AN ONUS, IS ON OUR CITIES WITH HOUSING  
18 DEVELOPMENT IN SUNSET. THERE IS A PIECE OF IT THERE THEY THINK  
19 WE NEED TO START LOOKING AT VERY INTENTIONAL POLICIES OUTSIDE  
20 OF THE MARKET IN ORDER TO CONTINUE PROVIDING MODERATE INCOME  
21 HOUSING AS THE DATA SHOWS THE NEEDLE MOVES A LITTLE BIT. I  
22 WILL LEAVE IT AT THAT.

23

24 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS. VICTORIA.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **VICTORIA FIERCE:** THANKS. I WANT TO ECHO A LOT OF WHAT FERNANDO  
2 JUST SAID PARTICULARLY ABOUT HOW WE NOW HAVE SOME OF THESE  
3 TOOLS TO FUND MODERATE INCOME HOUSING. EARLIER SOMEBODY SAID  
4 THAT SOME OF THE TOOLS TO CREATE MODERATE HOUSING ARE MOSTLY  
5 MARKET RATE. WELL SURE THAT'S BEEN TRUE FOR THE LAST 40 SOME  
6 YEARS BUT EIGHT YEARS IS A LONG TIME AND THAT'S OUR PLAN HERE  
7 AND YEARS AGO WE DIDN'T HAVE SB35, THE HOUSING ACCOUNTABILITY  
8 ACT WAS DEAD --

9

10 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** UH, OH IS THAT -- I SEE EVERYONE ELSE'S SCREEN.  
11 I SEE VICTORIA'S SCREEN FROZE. IT LOOKS LIKE YOU'RE BACK. I  
12 THINK THE SCREEN FROZE IN THE MIDDLE OF WHAT YOU WERE -- OF  
13 WHAT YOU WERE SAYING. START AT THE BEGINNING.

14

15 **VICTORIA FIERCE:** A LOT OF WHAT FERNANDO SAYS IS IT PUTS THE  
16 ONUS ON THE CITIES. EIGHT YEARS AGO WE DIDN'T HAVE --

17

18 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. IT HAPPENED AGAIN. I THINK MAYBE WE MOVE  
19 TO NELL, AND THEN WE'LL COME BACK TO VICTORIA?

20

21 **VICTORIA FIERCE:** THAT'S FINE.

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. VICTORIA IF YOU COULD PUT YOUR COMMENT  
24 INTO CHAT MAYBE THAT WOULD BE A WAY TO SHARE.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **NELL SELANDER:** I ASKED DAVE TO CLARIFY MY LAST QUESTION AND HE  
2 DID THAT IN CHAT BUT I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT, YOU KNOW,  
3 SOMETIME IN ANSWERING THESE QUESTIONS IT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO  
4 HAVE A VISUAL RESOURCE. SO I -- JUST A PLUG FOR ALL OF US  
5 VISUAL LEARNERS OUT THERE, I THINK ANYBODY THAT GETS INVOLVED  
6 IN CITY PLANNING NEEDS VISUAL REFERENCES, NOT JUST WORDS. SO  
7 JUST A REQUEST THAT IF YOU HAVE GOT A GRAPHIC THAT CAN HELP  
8 ANSWER THE QUESTION TO PLEASE SHOW IT OR USE IT. SO THE  
9 QUESTION THEY HAD ASKED PREVIOUSLY IS, WHY DOES IT FEEL LIKE  
10 WE'RE FRONT LOADING THE RHNA ALLOCATION, AND I THINK THE  
11 ANSWER IS PRETTY SIMPLE. YOU KNOW, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO SHARE  
12 MY SCREEN AND SHOW THE CHART THAT SHOWS WHY THIS IS ENDING UP  
13 DIFFERENTLY IN DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES BUT I THINK IT WOULD BE  
14 MORE USEFUL FOR STAFF TO SORT OF WALK US THROUGH THE MATH.  
15 BECAUSE IT MAKES SENSE TO ME NOW BUT IT DIDN'T A MOMENT AGO,  
16 AND I FEEL LIKE I'M PROBABLY NOT THE ONLY ONE THAT JUST NEEDS  
17 A VISUAL REFERENCE TO UNDERSTAND THESE NUMBERS. >DAVE VAUTIN:  
18 YEAH. THANKS FOR THAT FEEDBACK. I THINK JUST FOR THE BROADER  
19 GROUP, THE QUESTION ABOUT THE BASELINE, THERE WERE SOME USEFUL  
20 MATERIALS ON THIS IN THE LAST HMC PACKET WHERE WE WERE  
21 DISCUSSING THE BASELINE AND CORE OF IT IS TODAY WE'RE FOCUSING  
22 ON THE 2050 HOUSEHOLD TOTALS SO THE QUESTION CAME UP FROM A  
23 FEW FOLKS WHY IS THE BASELINE HIGHER THAN THE GROWTH RATE FOR,  
24 SAY, SAN MATEO COUNTY, AND THAT'S BECAUSE IN SOME PLACES THE  
25 2050 HOUSEHOLD SHARE IS HIGHER THAN THE GROWTH RATE OVER THE

August 28, 2020

1 PERIOD, AND OTHER PLACES, THE 2050 HOUSEHOLD SHARE IS LOWER  
2 THAN THE GROWTH RATE. AND SO THAT -- THOSE COMPARISON TABLES  
3 OF THE BASELINE ARE KIND OF A GOOD RESOURCE FROM THE LAST HMC  
4 IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO LEARN MORE.

5

6 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS DAVE. I WOULD LOVE FOR US TO MOVE BEYOND  
7 THIS AGENDA -- OR WHATEVER, DISCUSSION POINT, AND MOVE INTO  
8 OUR NEXT TWO. SO, IF ANYONE WANTS TO GIVE A LAST SORT OF PUSH  
9 FOR THE COMMITTEE TO JUST THE BOTTOM-UP INCOME GROUPING? IF  
10 ANYONE WANTS TO SPEAK AGAINST IT. JULIE YOU HAVE YOUR HAND  
11 RAISED THEN JEFF.

12

13 **JULIE PIERCE:** I DO. THANK YOU. THIS IS A GOOD DISCUSSION AND  
14 IT'S A REALLY TOUGH THING TO FIGURE OUT. BECAUSE WHILE STAFF  
15 IS RIGHT, VERY OFTEN MODERATE INCOME HOUSING NEEDS SUPPORT  
16 JUST LIKE THE VERY LOW AND LOW, I ALSO AGREE WITH SAN  
17 FRANCISCO THAT, YOU KNOW, WE GET A LOT OF OUR MODERATE THROUGH  
18 INCLUSIONARY AND THROUGH PERHAPS THE ADUS, NOW THAT THE RULES  
19 HAVE BEEN RELAXED A BIT ON SOME OF THE EXTRA CHARGES ON ADUS,  
20 I THOROUGHLY EXPECT THOSE TO PICK UP. AND, I GUESS THE  
21 COMMENTS I WOULD MAKE IS THAT, I DON'T THINK WE IS SOLVE ALL  
22 OF THE BAY AREA'S CHALLENGES IN ONE FELL SWOOP. BUT WE DO HAVE  
23 A MANDATE FROM THE STATE TO MEET OUR GREENHOUSE GAS TARGETS.  
24 AND SO WE HAVE A PATTERN OF A REGIONAL GROWING THAT NEEDS TO  
25 BE CORRECTED, I THINK, FIRST, TO TRY TO MEET THOSE TARGETS AND

August 28, 2020

1 TO REDUCE VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED. WE CERTAINLY HAVE ALL SEEN  
2 THAT MAYBE WE CAN MAKE PROGRESS IN THAT, BUT ONCE PEOPLE  
3 REALLY DO GO BACK TO WORK, I THINK OUR FREEWAYS ARE GOING TO  
4 BE SO JAMMED THAT IF WE DON'T START PUTTING HOUSING CLOSER TO  
5 WHERE THE JOBS ARE, WE'RE GOING TO BE IN TROUBLE. AND  
6 EXACERBATING SOME OF THE GROWTH IN THE OUTLYING AREAS, I THINK  
7 IS A PROBLEM. SO, I REALLY THINK WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT WHAT IT  
8 IS WE'RE FOCUSING ON AS A REGION. I UNDERSTAND HOUSING  
9 METHODOLOGY COMMITTEE HAS FOCUSED ON HOUSING, BUT ABAG HAS TO  
10 THINK ABOUT ALL OF IT. AND MY CONCERN IS THAT WE CAN'T DO IT  
11 ALL AT ONCE, BUT WHAT WE NEED TO FIX SOONER THAN LATER IS OUR  
12 TRAFFIC, OUR GHG, OUR VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED, AND FRANKLY THE  
13 QUALITY OF LIFE FOR FOLKS THAT ARE WORKING IN THOSE BIG JOB  
14 CENTERS. THESE FOUR HOURS A DAY ON THE ROAD ARE JUST  
15 INTOLERABLE FOR FAMILY LIFE. AND WE'RE FINDING THAT IT'S  
16 REALLY DAMAGING OUR SOCIAL FABRIC, AND OUR CIVIC INCLUSION.  
17 THAT'S IT FOR ME.

18

19 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS JULIE. JEFF, THEN AARTI.

20

21 **JEFF LEVIN:** THANKS. I DON'T FEEL REAL STRONGLY ONE WAY OR THE  
22 OTHER ON THESE OPTIONS ON MODERATE INCOME. ALTHOUGH I'M  
23 LEANING A BIT MORE TOWARDS GROUPED IT WITH VERY LOW AND LOW. I  
24 WANT TO REMIND US ALL THE PRIMARY IMPLICATION HERE HAS TO DO  
25 WITH WHICH CITIES ARE GOING TO HAVE TO PROVIDE HOW MUCH

August 28, 2020

1 ZONING. THAT IS THE PRIMARY IMPLICATION OF GETTING A BIGGER  
2 RHNA NUMBER. IN THE CASE OF MODERATE INCOME IT'S SIMPLY ZONING  
3 FOR UNITS UNLIKE VERY LOW AND LOW. IT WILL NOT NECESSARILY  
4 AFFECT HOW CITIES HAVE TO ZONE FOR MULTI-FAMILY. BUT, I WILL  
5 SAY THAT GROUPED WITH VERY LOW AND LOW SEEMS TO SPREAD OUT A  
6 BIT MORE THE ALLOCATIONS ON WITHOUT US MOVING TOO FAR IN THE  
7 DIRECTION OF SPRAWL. I THINK PROVIDING A BETTER RANGE OF  
8 OPPORTUNITIES FOR WHERE WE'RE TRYING TO CREATE OPPORTUNITY FOR  
9 MODERATE INCOME MAKES SOME SENSE. SO I'M LEANING A BIT MORE  
10 TOWARDS THE GROUPED WITH VERY LOW AND LOW. BUT PROBABLY WITH  
11 BOTH YELLOW EITHER WAY. I WANT PEOPLE TO REMEMBER IT'S  
12 PRIMARILY ABOUT WHO HAS TO DO THE ZONING.

13

14 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS JEFF. AARTI?

15

16 **AARTI SHRIVASTAVA:** SORRY. I DON'T MEAN TO DOWNGRADE THE  
17 CONVERSATION BUT I WAS THINKING IF NOW IS THE TIME TO MOVE  
18 BEYOND THE DISCUSSION ABOUT WHETHER MODERATE INCOME SHOULD ARE  
19 MOVED AND WHETHER WE CAN TALK ABOUT THE OTHER FACTORS. AND I  
20 WOULD LIKE TO HEAR MORE ABOUT THAT. I FEEL PRETTY STRONGLY  
21 ABOUT THE THREE FACTOR APPROACH, AS OPPOSED TO THE TWO FACTOR  
22 APPROACH. BECAUSE, I THINK, IN ALL OF THESE FACTORS, WE HAVE  
23 HIGHLIGHTED ACCESS TO HIGH RESOURCE AREAS AS AN IMPORTANT  
24 FACTOR AND IT SHOULD CONTINUE TO REMAIN ONE AS WELL AS  
25 JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE. JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE AND THE TRANSIT

August 28, 2020

1 ACTUALLY KEEP TO THE PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PLANNING, WHICH IS TO  
2 REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IS PUTTING MORE HOUSEHOLDS IN  
3 THE URBAN CORE. AND SO I DON'T THINK THE TRANSIT PART SHOULD  
4 DISAPPEAR FROM OUR RHNA ALLOCATION. ADDITIONAL E I THINK  
5 PLANNED BAY AREA ALREADY REFLECTS HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS, AND  
6 THE JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE. SO, IT'S NOT MISSING FROM THAT BASE  
7 EQUATION, AS WE'RE LOOKING AT THIS, THAT WOULD REQUIRE US TO  
8 WEIGH THOSE TWO ISSUES VERY, VERY HEAVILY IN THIS PARTICULAR  
9 APPROACH. I HAVE ALSO LOOKED AT THE METRICS THAT GILLIAN  
10 PROVIDED, THANK YOU FOR THAT. AND BECAUSE OF THAT, I'M EVEN  
11 OPEN TO USING ONE B AS OPPOSED TO 1A IF IT ACTUALLY MEETS  
12 RATHER THAN DOESN'T MEET THE METRICS, BUT I DON'T BELIEVE  
13 TRANSIT SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE EQUATION BECAUSE I FEEL  
14 IT'S JUST AS IMPORTANT AS EVERYTHING ELSE. I'M NOT GOING TO GO  
15 INTO THE LETTER WE SENT FOR PLANNED BAY AREA FAR SANTA CLARA  
16 COUNTY. WE DO HAVE SOME CONCERNS ABOUT MAKING SURE THIS EIGHT  
17 YEAR PERIOD WE'RE ACTUALLY ABLE TO ACHIEVE THESE NUMBERS AND  
18 REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS SINCE THE TRANSIT  
19 INFRASTRUCTURE HASN'T CAUGHT UP WITH THE PLAN. AT SOME POINT I  
20 THINK WE CAN DO IT. BUT FOR THIS PERIOD, I THINK WE SHOULD  
21 GIVE SOME WEIGHT WE'RE NOT GIVING TOO MUCH, BUT SOME WEIGHT TO  
22 TRANSIT.

23

24 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS AARTI. OKAY FOLKS. I THINK WE NEED TO  
25 MOVE TOWARDS A DECISION POINT. AND I THINK WE CAN TAKE IT THE

August 28, 2020

1 WAY IT'S FRAMED IN THE PACKET AND SEE WHERE YOU FALL BEFORE WE  
2 GET TO THE DECISION POINT. I THINK WE NEED TO PAUSE FOR PUBLIC  
3 COMMENT. JUST GIVING YOU A HEAD'S UP, FRED, AND CHAIR. SO I'LL  
4 JUST READ THE DECISION POINT AND THEN YOU CAN THINK ABOUT IT  
5 AS WE OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. DOES HMC RECOMMEND ADJUSTING  
6 BOTTOM-UP INCOME GROUPED -- MODERATED USING SAME FACTORS AS  
7 VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME UNITS? THEN WE'LL TAKE A QUICK PAUSE.

8

9 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** WE'LL TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THAT  
10 DECISION POINT THAT WAS JUST READ. AND IF ATTENDEES WOULD LIKE  
11 TO SPEAK ON THAT TOPIC PLEASE USE YOUR RAISED HAND ICON OR IF  
12 YOU'RE PHONING IN PRESS STAR NINE. I SEE WE HAVE ONE RAISED  
13 HAND.

14

15 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** ONE MOMENT PLEASE. MR. CHAIR, HOW LONG IS  
16 THE COMMENT PERIOD?

17

18 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** SINCE WE ONLY HAVE ONE RAISED HAND, TWO  
19 MINUTES.

20

21 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. OUR FIRST SPEAKER IS ERIN  
22 ECKHOUSE, GO AHEAD.

23

24 **SPEAKER:** THANK YOU. I DON'T HAVE PARTICULARLY STRONG FEELINGS  
25 ABOUT WHERE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING SHOULD BE GROUPED. I THINK

**August 28, 2020**

1 BASICALLY IT'S A QUESTION YOU GROUP IT WITH LOWER INCOME  
2 HOUSING IT WILL BE ALLOCATED PRIMARILY BASED ON ACCESS TO  
3 OPPORTUNITY. IF YOU GROUP IT WITH MARKET RATE HOUSING IT WILL  
4 BE GROUPED TO ACCESS TO JOBS BOTH OF THOSE WOULD BE  
5 APPROPRIATE. I DO WANT TO ADDRESS SOME OF WHAT I'M SEEING IN  
6 THE CHAT AND HAVE HEARD ABOUT THIS LETTER FROM PIEDMONT. I  
7 DON'T THINK THE HMC SHOULD GIVE ANY DEFERENCE TO PIEDMONT'S  
8 OPINION PIEDMONT IS EXCLUSIONARY IN THE ENTIRE COUNTRY AND IF  
9 THEY ARE SAYING THEY SHOULD GET LESS HOUSING GROWTH I DON'T  
10 THINK YOU SHOULD TAKE THAT AS A VALID CONCERN. SO SOME PLACES  
11 ARE GOING TO GET MORE HOUSING GROWTH THAN THEY WANT, UNDER  
12 THIS PROCESS, THAT'S THE REALITY OF IT. AND I THINK, YOU KNOW,  
13 IF PIEDMONT HAS A PROBLEM WITH THAT, THAT'S THEIR PROBLEM AND  
14 IT SHOULDN'T BE A REGIONAL PROBLEM TO SOLVE. THANKS.

15

16 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** OKAY. THANK YOU.

17

18 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS RICHARD HEDGES. GO  
19 AHEAD RICHARD.

20

21 **RICHARD HEDGES:** YES I'M JUST OFFERING A COMMENT ABOUT AS MUCH  
22 HOUSING AS POSSIBLE NEAR TRANSIT. I UNDERSTAND THE OTHER  
23 COMMENTS. ONE OF THE COMMENTERS ASKED A QUESTION ABOUT SAN  
24 MATEO COUNTY WHY SOME COMMUNITIES ARE COMING TOGETHER. IT'S  
25 CALLED POLITICAL WILL. I HAVE BEEN A LEADER AMONG OTHERS IN

August 28, 2020

1 GETTING THAT HOUSING PASSED. WE'RE DOING ABOUT 2100 UNITS  
2 AROUND OUR HAYWARD PARK TRAIN STATION, ABOUT 1100 PLUS OFFICE  
3 AND RETAIL AT OUR HILLS DALE STATION AND WE HAVE SOMETHING ON  
4 THE BALLOT FOR NOVEMBER THAT IT WILL ALLOW US, IF POSSIBLE, IF  
5 THE CITY SO DEEMS IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE HOUSING NEAR  
6 DOWNTOWN. WE HAVE ALREADY DONE SOME BUT NOT ENOUGH NEAR  
7 DOWNTOWN O THANK YOU. LET ME FINISH UP WITH A POLITICAL  
8 COMMENT. IT'S POLITICAL WELL, WHAT LEARNING IS WILLING TO DO.  
9 THANK YOU.

10

11 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. MR. MAYOR AT THIS TIME, THERE  
12 WERE SIX PUBLIC COMMENTS SUBMITTED IN WRITING AND THOSE  
13 COMMENTS WERE SENT TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND POSTED ONLINE AND  
14 THERE WAS AN ADDITIONAL COMMENT SHARED BY PAUL CAMPOS EARLIER.

15

16 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT COMPLETES  
17 PUBLIC COMMENT.

18

19 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AS A REMINDER ABOUT OUR  
20 MODIFIED CONSENSUS DECISION MAKING PROCESS. WE AGREED IN  
21 DECEMBER TO USE RED, GREEN, AND YELLOW CARDS TO SHARE YOUR  
22 SORT OF TEMPERATURE ON THE DECISION POINT, IF YOU COULD WRITE  
23 OUT, GREEN, YELLOW, AND RED MAYBE YOU HAVE THEM FROM LAST  
24 TIME. GREEN CARD MEANS YOU STRONGLY DEGREE WITH THE DECISION  
25 POINT, AND YELLOW MEANS YOU SOMEWHAT PROPOSED OR IN THE

August 28, 2020

1 MIDDLE. RED MEANS YOU DISAGREE. IF YOU CAN PREPARE TO SHARE  
2 THE GRID SCREEN WITH THE ATTENDEES, SO THEY CAN SEE AND SORT  
3 OF MOVE THROUGH THE SCREENS SO THAT WE CAN SEE EVERYONE.  
4 STAFF, IF YOU DON'T MIND TURNING OFF YOUR VIDEO, AND HMC  
5 MEMBERS, IF YOU HAVE A VIRTUAL BACKGROUND, IT CAN BE A LITTLE  
6 CHALLENGING, SO IF YOU DON'T MIND TURNING THAT OFF. AGAIN, THE  
7 DECISION POINT IS, DOES HMC RECOMMEND ADJUSTING THE BOTTOM-UP  
8 INCOME GROUPEd, THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE ALLOCATED USING  
9 SAME FACTOR AS LOW AND VERY LOW INCOME UNITS TODAY WE'RE GOING  
10 TO LOOK FOR EIGHT RED CARDS THAT WOULD BLOCK THE DECISION  
11 POINT AND 16 YELLOW CARDS. I'LL GIVE YOU A SECOND TO GET YOUR  
12 CARDS TOGETHER. AND JESS THIS WOULD BE THE TIME THAT WOULD BE  
13 AWESOME IF YOU COULD SHARE WITH THE ATTENDEES THE GRID SCREEN.

14

15 **PAT ECKLUND:** I VOTED IN THE CHAT.

16

17 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** I SEE. IN THE CHAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

18

19 **SPEAKER:** AMBER, DID YOU SEE MY VOTE TOO?

20

21 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** WHO IS SPEAKING SO I CAN MAKE SURE I SEE IT.

22

23 **SPEAKER:** THIS IS RODNEY. GREEN FOR ME.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** GREAT. THANK YOU. YEAH, I'M SEEING 6, 7, THEN  
2 PAT, YOU'RE RED. SO I'M SEEING, IT'S EIGHT REDS AND A BUNCH OF  
3 YELLOWS. I -- IF YOU WANT TO -- DO YOU WANT ME TO DO AN EXACT  
4 COUNT? I CAN. BUT I'M SEEING ENOUGH YELLOWS AND REDS THEY  
5 WOULD SAY THIS DECISION POINT IS BLOCKED. AND THAT WE WOULD  
6 WANT TO HAVE MORE DISCUSSION IF WE ACTUALLY WANTED TO MOVE  
7 FORWARD WITH A GROUPING OF THE UNITS. I WOULD SAY WE CAN  
8 COMPLETE THE DECISION POINT. AND IT'S BLOCKED. THANK YOU TO  
9 THE HMC MEMBERS AND STAFF. YOU CAN TURN YOUR VIDEOS BACK ON,  
10 AND I THINK WE WANT TO MOVE ON. YES, WE REALLY WANTED TO TAKE  
11 A TEN MINUTE BREAK AT 10:30 SO MAYBE THIS IS THE TIME TO TAKE  
12 THE BREAK. THEN WE'LL COME BACK AND DO THE PERFORMANCE METRICS  
13 WHEN WE COME BACK FROM THE BREAK AND HOPEFULLY MOVE THROUGH  
14 THOSE QUICKLY AS WE GET TO THE METHODOLOGY QUESTION.

15

16 **SPEAKER:** I CAN JUST CONFIRM WHAT JUST HAPPENED? THERE WASN'T  
17 ENOUGH VOTES?

18

19 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** YEAH. I SAW SEVEN READ CARDS. SO WITH THE  
20 ATTENDANCE TODAY, IF YOU HAVE EIGHT RED CARDS BLOCKS THE  
21 DECISION POINTS AND THERE WERE A LOT OF YELLOWS SO I THINK  
22 WITH THE RED CARDS AND YELLOWS, THERE WERE TOO MANY PEOPLE WHO  
23 WERE NOT IN SUPPORT OF THE DECISION POINT.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** THE MOD IS GOING TO STAY WITH HIGH INCOME ABOVE  
2 MARKET.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THAT'S WHAT THAT MEANS. YES.

5

6 **AARTI SHRIVASTAVA:** IF I MAY SUGGEST WE HOLD THIS DECISION  
7 UNTIL THE NEXT ONE. I THINK THEY NEED TO TAKE IN CONJUNCTION  
8 THE FACTORS.

9

10 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** WHEN A DECISION POINT IS BLOCKED IT DOESN'T  
11 MEAN YOU CAN'T HAVE ANOTHER CONVERSATION ABOUT IT I THINK WITH  
12 YOUR TIME AS A COMMITTEE TOGETHER YOU MIGHT WANT TO MOVE ON TO  
13 THE NEXT TOPIC OF CONVERSATION BUT IT SEEMS IN THE  
14 CONVERSATION ABOUT PERFORMANCE METRICS THAT YOU WANT TO  
15 REVISIT THIS INCOME UNIT GROUPED. IT'S MORE THAN FINE. LET'S  
16 DO A TEN MINUTE BREAK. IF WE CAN COME BACK AT 10:40 WE'RE  
17 GOING TO START RIGHT ON THE NOSE, AT 10:40 AND KEEP GOING WITH  
18 OUR CONVERSATION. [ BREAK ] (RETURNING AT 10:40)

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY CHAIR ARREGUIN AND FRED, WHENEVER YOU GUYS  
21 ARE READY. FRED, IS IT OKAY TO GET US ROLLING AGAIN?

22

23 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** I THINK WE SHOULD WAIT FOR THE CHAIR, AT  
24 THE VERY LEAST. JESSE, ARE YOU ON THE LINE?

25

August 28, 2020

1 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. I'LL HOLD MY HORSES.

2

3 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** JUST A COUPLE MORE MINUTES. HE'S ON HIS  
4 WAY.

5

6 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** NO PROBLEM.

7

8 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THERE HE S.

9

10 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I'M HERE. YES. I THINK IT'S PROBABLY  
11 BEEN MORE THAN TEN MINUTES.

12

13 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** I THINK WE'RE READY TO START IF YOU ARE.

14

15 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** READY.

16

17 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** JUST TO CLARIFY ON THE LAST DECISION POINTS, IT  
18 WAS A RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE THE WAY THE INCOME GROUPINGS  
19 WERE BEING HANDLED AND BECAUSE THERE WAS NO CONSENSUS TO  
20 CHANGE, IT JUST STAYS THE SAME. IF YOU GUYS WANT TO KEEP  
21 TALKING ABOUT IT, WE COULD. WE COULD KEEP GOING ALL DAY ON  
22 THAT. BUT I THINK IT MAKES SENSE TO MOVE ON TO THE PERFORMANCE  
23 METRICS AND IF, IN THE CONVERSATION, YOU WANT TO LOOK BACK TO  
24 THE WAY THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE GROUPED, WE CAN  
25 CERTAINLY DO THAT. BUT I THINK WE COULD TAKE, IDEAL E NOT MORE

August 28, 2020

1 THAN A HALF HOUR HERE TO TALK ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE METRICS SO  
2 WE HAVE AS MUCH TIME AS WE CAN, TO TALK ABOUT METHODOLOGY.  
3 WE'LL START WITH CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND MOVE INTO DISCUSSION  
4 ON THE PERFORMANCE METRIC. USE THE RAISE YOUR HAND FUNCTION.  
5 SUSAN, I SEE YOUR HAND IS UP.

6

7 **SUSAN ADAMS:** THANK YOU. I AM JUST CURIOUS GOING FORWARD, ON  
8 THE LAST ITEM THAT WE DISCUSSED WE HAD RED CARDS, YELLOW CARDS  
9 AND GREEN CARDS. AT SOME POINT WILL WE JUST BE USING RED CARDS  
10 AND BETWEEN CARDS TO MAKE DECISIONS?

11

12 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE CAN STICK WITH  
13 THE MODIFIED CONSENSUS VOTING THAT YOU ALL APPROVED THROUGH  
14 THE END OF THE MEETING. BUT AT THE END THERE IS GOING TO BE AN  
15 ITEM AT THE SEPTEMBER MEETING WHERE WE WILL BE DOING A ROLL  
16 CALL VOTE AND I THINK YOU HAVE TO APPROVE YES OR NO AND IT'S  
17 ON THE RECORD. AS LONG AS THIS PROCESS IS HELPFUL FOR YOU IN  
18 SORT OF NAVIGATING AND NARROWING SO YOU'RE GETTING THE  
19 INFORMATION FROM ABAG STAFF TO MAKE THE DECISION WE CAN KEEP  
20 USING IT BUT IT'S PROBABLY NOT AS VALUABLE FOR YOU IN  
21 SEPTEMBER.

22

23 **SUSAN ADAMS:** THANK YOU.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** ANYONE HAVE FEELINGS ON THE PERFORMANCE METRICS  
2 WE USED TODAY? DARIN?

3

4 **DARIN RANELETTI:** THANK YOU. QUESTION FOR STAFF, IF THEY COULD  
5 EXPLAIN THE METRICS IDENTIFY 25 JURISDICTION, IN DIFFERENT  
6 CATEGORIES, CAN YOU REMIND ME, DID WE DISCUSS THAT AS AN HMC  
7 DID WE AGREE UPON THAT AND WHAT'S THE RATIONALE BEHIND THAT.  
8 I'M CURIOUS DOES THAT ACTUALLY COVER MUCH OF THE BAY AREA? OR  
9 IS IT A SMALL SLIVER. REASON I ASK, IS WHEN WE'RE LOOKING AT  
10 FAIR HOUSING IS IT REALLY CAPTURING THE EXTEND OF PREVIOUSLY  
11 EXCLUSIONARY POLICIES THAT ARE HAVING AN EFFECT ON THE HOUSING  
12 MARKET? THANK YOU.

13

14 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** AKSEL, DO YOU WANT TO EXPLAIN? THE GENERAL  
15 CONCEPT IS LOOKING AT PLACE IN THE REGION THAT ARE MOST  
16 AFFECTED AND COMPARING THEM TO THE REST OF THE REGION. BUT  
17 I'LL LET AKSEL TALK ABOUT YOUR QUESTION ABOUT SCOPE AND HOW  
18 MUCH OF THE REGION THAT COVERS.

19

20 **AKSEL OLSEN:** RIGHT. IT DEPENDS ON THE VARIABLE IN QUESTION.  
21 FOR SOME, THE TOP 25 OF A VARIABLE WILL BE RELATIVELY LARGE  
22 SHARE FOR THE REGION'S POPULATION FOR OTHER MEASURES WHEN IT'S  
23 A SMALLER JURISDICTION WILL BE SMALLER. SO IT JUST DEPENDING  
24 ON WHICH METRICS IS WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT -- IN GENERAL. IT'S  
25 HALF THE POPULATION OR A THIRD OF THE POPULATION. WE JUST TOOK

August 28, 2020

1 THE TOP 25 TO GET US IN SO THE MOST OUTER LYING PARTS OF THE  
2 REGION IN TERMS OF A VARIABLE IN HOW THEY PERFORM A LITMUS  
3 TEST AND HOW THE RHNA ALLOCATION IS WORKING FOR THAT SUBSET  
4 RELATIVE TO THE REST OF THE REGION. IT GIVES US A SENSE OF THE  
5 MOST EXTREME AMOUNT OF PARTICULAR MEASURE -- WELL NOT EXTREME,  
6 BUT ABOUT A QUARTER OF THE JURISDICTION HOW THEY PERFORM AS A  
7 LITMUS TEST.

8

9 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** AND JUST TO CLARIFY THAT LIST OF SORT OF 25  
10 VARIES DEPENDING ON WHAT OBJECTIVE WE'RE TRYING TO ADDRESS OR  
11 WHAT METRIC WE'RE USING SO IT'S NOT A CONSISTENT SET OF 25 FOR  
12 EACH METRIC. AGAIN, SOME ARE TALKING ABOUT THE JURISDICTION  
13 WITH THE HIGHEST OR MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSING COST. SOMETIMES  
14 IT'S TALKING ABOUT THE PLACES THAT HAVE THE MOST CENSUS TRACTS  
15 THAT ARE IN THE HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS, SO I THINK THAT'S WHAT  
16 AKSEL WAS GETTING AT. IT VARIES, THE SORT OF TOPIC THAT WE ARE  
17 TALKING ABOUT FOR EACH METRIC AND THE SCOPE OF HOW MUCH  
18 JURISDICTION OR POPULATION VARIES IN EACH OF THOSE.

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANK YOU. NOAH, DO YOU HAVE A QUESTION.

21

22 **SPEAKER:** MORE A COMMENT, AS WE HAVE BEEN GOING THROUGH THIS  
23 PROCESS AND I HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT ALL THE INFORMATION  
24 PROVIDED AND MAKE MY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS I HAVE  
25 REALLY TRIED TO KEEP THE THREE MAIN PRIORITIES THAT WE

August 28, 2020

1 IDENTIFIED, AND MY GROUP AS AN HMC MEMBER, BACK AT THE MARCH  
2 MEETING AND WHAT WE IDENTIFIED IS THAT, YOU KNOW, WE WANTED TO  
3 SEE MORE UNITS BUILT IN HIGH RESOURCE AREAS BOTH BELOW MARKET  
4 RATE UNITS AND JUST MORE UNIT IN GENERAL. THERE IS A  
5 PERCEPTION THAT SOME OF THOSE COMMUNITIES HAVEN'T  
6 TRADITIONALLY BUILT AS MUCH HOUSING AS SOME OF THE OTHER  
7 COMMUNITIES SO THAT'S KIND OF CONTRIBUTED TO SOME OF THE  
8 REDUCTIONS BUT THEN ALSO PROVIDING MORE HOUSING THERE WILL  
9 PROVIDE MORE FOLKS OPPORTUNITIES TO ACCESS THOSE HIGH  
10 RESOURCES. AVOIDING DISPLACEMENT, WE HAD THE GENTRIFICATION  
11 CONVERSATION TO MAKE SURE THAT AS WE DO THIS PROCESS WE'RE NOT  
12 PUTTING MORE AND MORE FOLKS -- FORCING THEM TO LEAVE THEIR  
13 COMMUNITIES THAT THEY'RE ALREADY IN. AND THEN ALSO PUTTING  
14 INCREASED UNITS NEAR TRANSIT. RIGHT. THAT GETS TO SOME OF THE  
15 POINTS JULIE WAS MAKING ON BIG PICTURE ITEMS WITH REGARDS TO  
16 REDUCING VMTS SUPER CENTER GROWTH AND CONTINUING THE ECHOES  
17 FOR THE LAST 20 YEARS THAT'S BEEN INFORMING OUR PLANNING  
18 DECISIONS. SO I'M LESS FOCUSED OR WORRIED ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL  
19 FACTORS OR METRICS BUT I JUST -- I'M MORE WORRIED ABOUT THE  
20 OUTCOME, AS WE SHUFFLE THESE ALLOCATIONS AND DOES IT REALLY  
21 PUSH THAT -- THOSE THREE MAIN CRITICAL THINGS THEY THINK WE  
22 HAVE HIGHLIGHTED. SO THAT'S MY COMMENT.

23

24 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS NOAH AARTI?

25

August 28, 2020

1 **AARTI SHRIVASTAVA:** VERY MUCH IN NOAH'S VAIN, I WANT TO GET TO  
2 QUESTION THREE FIRST. AND FRANKLY, IF THE THREE FACTOR  
3 APPROACH IS USED, I AM AGNOSTIC AS TO USING WITH WHERE THE  
4 MODERATE INCOME HOUSING FALLS AND OPEN TO LOOKING AT THE  
5 MODIFIED METRIC. SO I DON'T KNOW HOW WE CAN RECONCILE THIS.  
6 BUT IT SEEMS TO ME, WALKING US THROUGH DECISION, CLOSING THAT,  
7 THE SECOND DECISION, CLOSING THAT, ALMOST SEEMS TO LEAD US TO  
8 NOT HAVING A CHOICE ON THE THIRD DECISION. BUT THAT'S HOW I'M  
9 FEELING. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY OTHERS ARE FEELING THAT WAY.

10

11 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** NELL?

12

13 **NELL SELANDER:** SO IF YOU LOOK AT -- I TOTALLY SECOND AARTI'S  
14 COMMENTS ABOUT IT FEELS LIKE WE'RE BEING FUNNELED AND MAYBE  
15 NOT REALLY TAKING THE TIME TO UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION AND THEN  
16 ASK THE QUESTION FROM BOTH DIRECTIONS, PARTICULARLY ON THE  
17 LAST ONE, I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE ASKED BOTH SIDES OF THE  
18 QUESTION, DO WE WANT MODERATE IN THE LOW INCOME OR -- YOU MAY  
19 HAVE REACHED CONSENSUS, I THINK THERE IS SOME FINESSING HERE  
20 THAT WE NEED. AND THEN GOING TO THE PERFORMANCE METRICS WHICH  
21 I UNDERSTAND THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT NOW, WHAT I DON'T  
22 UNDERSTAND IS WHY THE SCALE IS CHANGING. SO IT WOULD SEEM TO  
23 ME THAT IF A SCALE -- SO -- THERE IS NO PAGE NUMBERS ON THE  
24 PRESENTATION. MAYBE THERE ARE. 17 -- IT'S GOT TO PAGE EIGHT --  
25 SLIDE 18 OF GILLIAN'S PRESENTATION. WHICH I THINK THE WAY

August 28, 2020

1 THESE ARE LAID OUT IS REALLY HELPFUL SO THAT YOU CAN SORT OF  
2 SEE THEM ALL IN ONE SCREEN, BUT MY QUESTION S18 IS A GOOD  
3 EXAMPLE OF THIS, BECAUSE YOU HAVE GOT THE -- THEY AXIS, S AXIS  
4 SCALED ON METRIC 18.1 TO LESS THAN FIVE AND THE NEXT CHARTS  
5 ARE SCALED TO 1.2. SO WHAT DOES ONE MEAN? AND THEN ON THE  
6 FOLLOWING SLIDE, YOU ONLY GO TO .15. SO ARE WE TRYING TO HAVE  
7 AN OBJECTIVE MEASURE HERE? IN WHICH CASE SHOULDN'T THEY ALL BE  
8 SCALED AT THE SAME RATE? OR IS IT JUST IN COMPARISON TO THE  
9 OTHER JURISDICTION? BECAUSE IT SEEMS LIKE FOR SOME OF THESE WE  
10 ACTUALLY DO WANT AN OBJECTIVE MEASURE, JUST BEING BETTER THAN  
11 EVERYONE ELSE -- BETTER -- THE TOP 25 BEING BETTER THAN  
12 EVERYONE ELSE DOESN'T MEAN WE'RE BETTER OBJECTIVELY IMPROVING  
13 THINGS. I'M WONDERING WHAT WE'RE MEASURING AGAINST IF THE  
14 SCALE IS ALWAYS CHANGING?

15

16 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** I'M GOING TO TAKE A STAB AT ANSWERING THAT  
17 QUESTIONS. REASONS THE SCALES ARE DIFFERENT IS BECAUSE WE'RE  
18 ASKING DIFFERENT QUESTIONS. I APOLOGIZE IF THE PAGE NUMBER GOT  
19 COVERED. SLIDE 18 TALKING ABOUT VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME  
20 JURISDICTION. IF IT WAS ONE THAT WOULD MEAN 100 PERCENT OF  
21 UNITS ARE VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME. WHAT YOU CAN SEE IS THAT  
22 OPTION 2A AND 1A COME CLOSE TO HAVING 50 PERCENT OF THEIR  
23 ALLOCATION AS VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME UNITS. ON THE CHART ON  
24 THE RIGHT LOOKING AT PROPORTIONAL, IF THE RHNA ALLOCATION  
25 PROPORTIONAL TO THE EXISTING HOUSEHOLD? SO THAT'S WHERE YOU

August 28, 2020

1 KIND OF HAVE THAT DOTTED LINE AT ONE, WHICH IS EXACTLY  
2 PROPORTIONAL AND IN SOME CASES THE ALLOCATIONS ARE LESS THAN  
3 PROPORTIONAL AND IN SOME CASES IS GREATER THAN PROPORTIONAL.  
4 AND I THINK, AGAIN, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE BEEN USING SORT OF --  
5 THE FRAMEWORK THAT WE HAVE SEEN HCD USE WHICH IS COMPARING  
6 JURISDICTION THAT CONSIDER CHARACTERISTIC AND HOW THE  
7 ALLOCATIONS THAT THE METHODOLOGIES CREATE KIND OF ARE  
8 DIRECTING MORE RHNA TO THOSE KINDS OF PLACES. AND AGAIN, IT  
9 DEPENDS ON THE TOPIC THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, WHAT THOSE  
10 PLACES ARE AND WHAT THOSE SORT OF TOP JURISDICTION ARE. BUT  
11 ARE WE GENERALLY DIRECTING MORE RHNA TO THOSE PLACES THAN  
12 OTHER PLACES IN THE REGION THAT DON'T HAVE THOSE  
13 CHARACTERISTICS? AND I THINK WE HAVE NOT TRIED TO CREATE, AS  
14 YOU HAVE MENTIONED, LIKE AN OBJECTIVE STANDARD, LIKE IT SHOULD  
15 BE THIS NUMBER. AND I THINK PART OF THAT S AS YOU CAN SEE WHEN  
16 YOU LOOK AT THESE METRICS THERE IS FIVE DIFFERENT OBJECTIVES  
17 THAT ARE COVERING A LOT OF DIFFERENT TOPICS, AND TRYING -- I  
18 THINK PART OF THE ROLE OF WHAT YOU'RE HAVING TO DO IS FINDING  
19 THE RIGHT BALANCE AMONGST ALL OF THOSE THINGS. AND I THINK  
20 TRYING TO SET AN OBJECTIVE STANDARD FOR EACH OF THOSE, I THINK  
21 WOULD BE REALLY CHALLENGING.

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS GILLIAN. RUBY.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** ARE WE STILL ON DECISION NUMBER TWO OR STILL TALKING  
2 ABOUT MODERATE INCOME BEING GROUPED.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** WE'RE ON TWO TALKING ABOUT PERFORMANCE METRICS.

5

6 **SPEAKER:** CLARIFICATION WHEN BEING LOOKING AT THE PERFORMANCE  
7 METRIC 4 AND 5, JUST ONE CLARIFICATION QUESTION, AND THEN A  
8 COMMENT. IS THAT -- I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE I'M UNDERSTANDING  
9 THAT IN METRIC FOUR, IT'S BASICALLY SAYING, YOU KNOW, ALTHOUGH  
10 HIGH INCOME JURISDICTIONS HAVE A HIGHER SHARE OF THE  
11 AFFORDABLE HOUSING, THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT THE  
12 TOTAL RHNA NUMBER OVERALL WOULD BE THAT HIGH. SO IT COULD BE  
13 TEN AND THEY WOULD SCORE HIGHLY ON METRIC NUMBER FOUR IF ON  
14 FIVE OF THOSE UNITS WERE BELOW MARKET. IS THAT RIGHT?

15

16 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** THAT'S CORRECT. SO JUST TO CLARIFY, THAT WE  
17 ADDED A -- THIS WAS KIND OF THE QUESTION THAT WE HAD, WHICH  
18 WAS A LOT OF THE METRICS THAT WE STARTED WITH WERE ASKING JUST  
19 ONLY THIS QUESTION ABOUT PROPORTIONALITY OF LOWER INCOME UNITS  
20 AND SO NOW THE ONES THAT WE HAVE ADDED ARE TRYING TO GET AT  
21 WHAT I THINK YOU'RE ASKING IS WHAT ABOUT THE TOTAL ALLOCATION,  
22 AND IF YOU LOOK AT -- SORRY. AKSEL S IT ONE OF THE FIVE --  
23 AKSEL, WHICH ONE, PLEASE?

24

25 **AKSEL OLSEN:** IT'S FIVE C, I BELIEVE.

August 28, 2020

1

2 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** IT'S THE QUESTIONS IT GETS TO IN FOUR.

3

4 **SPEAKER:** THE ADDITIONAL METRIC WAS ACTUALLY IN NUMBER FIVE AND  
5 WHEN YOU LOOK AT NUMBER FIVE IT WAS INTERESTING TO ME THAT, ON  
6 METRIC NUMBER 4, 1A AND ONE B AND 2C SCORED HIGHLY BUT WHEN  
7 YOU LOOK AT 5C IT'S BELOW -- MOST OF THOSE ARE ACTUALLY BELOW  
8 THE PROPORTIONALITY OF THE ONE. RIGHT? SO IT GETS AT THIS  
9 THING OF, YES, THE HIGHER INCOME JURISDICTION ARE GETTING  
10 ALLOCATED MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, BUT THEIR OVERALL NUMBER IS  
11 LOW SO WHAT IMPACT IS THAT REALLY MAKING. SO THAT'S MY  
12 CONCERN, IS THAT, GREAT, I'M GLAD THAT THE AFFORDABILITY IS  
13 HIGH IN SOME OF THESE JURISDICTION THAT ARE GETTING -- THAT  
14 ARE HIGH INCOME HIGH OPPORTUNITY AREAS, BUT IF THEIR TOTAL  
15 NUMBER IS LOW, HOW IMPACTFUL IS THAT REALLY SO THAT'S WHAT  
16 DRAWS ME TO 3B AS THE OPTIONS. BUT THE OTHER THING I WANTED TO  
17 RAISE -- AND I WAS SURPRISED AT HOW 3B DID, NOT ON METRIC FIVE  
18 BUT IN THE OTHER METRICS OF THIS BECAUSE IT SCORED LOW FOR  
19 EXAMPLE, ON METRIC FOUR, AND SO THAT WAS KIND OF INTERESTING  
20 TO SEE, BUT THE KIND OF QUESTION I HAD ON THIS THOUGH TOO, IS  
21 FOR OBJECTIVE NUMBER FIVE, A FURTHER -- AFFIRMATIVELY  
22 FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING, I FEEL LIKE IT REALLY FALLS SHORT ON  
23 THE RACE PIECE. RIGHT? WHICH IS REALLY WHAT IT'S ABOUT TOO,  
24 AND THAT WE'RE NOT ASKING ANY RACE EXPLICIT QUESTIONS, AND I  
25 THINK THIS CAME UP BEFORE IN THE PAST THAT, YOU KNOW, WE

August 28, 2020

1 COULDN'T MAYBE CALL OUT BLACK POPULATION OR SOMETHING LIKE  
2 THAT, BUT IS THERE NOT A WAY THAT WE CAN CALL OUT NON-WHITE,  
3 OR HISTORICALLY UNDERREPRESENTED, OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT AS A  
4 METRIC ALSO TO HELP IDENTIFY THESE MORE EXCLUSIONARY PLACES  
5 THAT, YOU KNOW, COULD BENEFIT FROM HAVING MORE HOUSING  
6 ALLOCATION?

7

8 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** YEAH. SO THE WAY THAT WE HAVE TRIED TO ADDRESS  
9 KIND OF SEGREGATION IN THE METRICS IS LOOKING AT THE  
10 DIVERSIONS INDEX WHICH AGAIN KIND OF MEASURES HOW THE  
11 COMMUNITY COMPARES ON ITS RACIAL DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE COMPARED  
12 TO THE REST OF THE REGION. AND I THINK, AGAIN, I CAN -- MAYBE  
13 MATT OR LEGAL COUNSEL CAN STEP IN AND TALK ABOUT SORT OF THE  
14 CHALLENGES OR WHAT'S POSSIBLE IN TERMS OF HAVING A SPECIFIC OR  
15 METRIC TO RACE.

16

17 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANK YOU GUYS. I SAW A COUPLE OF REQUESTS FOR  
18 LINKS TO WHERE WE WERE IN THE PACKET DURING THAT CONVERSATION.  
19 I'LL TRY TO PUT THAT IN CHAT SO YOU CAN LOOK BACK. SORRY I  
20 DIDN'T CATCH THAT RIGHT AWAY. NEYSA, TAWNY THEN AARTI.

21

22 **NEYSA FLIGOR:** THANK YOU. I HAVE TWO QUESTIONS. FIRST ONE IS  
23 DIRECTLY SIMILAR TO WHAT RUBY WAS JUST ASKING. BECAUSE I'M  
24 HAVING A DIFFICULT TIME ANSWERING THE DECISION POINT QUESTION.  
25 BECAUSE FOR THE OBJECTIVES AND THE DIFFERENT METRICS AS I GO

August 28, 2020

1 THROUGH THEM, I END UP IN DIFFERENT PLACES. SO I DON'T KNOW IF  
2 I AM YES FOR THREE OF THE FIVE, AND NO FOR TWO, OR IF I LIKE  
3 ONE METRIC OVER THE OTHER, HOW I WOULD AT THE END, ANSWER THAT  
4 DECISION POINT QUESTION. BECAUSE I THINK THERE ARE PROS AND  
5 CONS TO EACH OF THESE OBJECTIVES AND IT'S DIFFICULT FOR ME TO  
6 FIGURE OUT WHERE WOULD I END UP IN ANSWERING YOUR DECISION  
7 POINT NUMBER TWO. SUCH AS DELVING THROUGH EACH OBJECTIVE AND  
8 GOING BACK TO WHAT AARTI HAS SAID ABOUT GOING THROUGH EACH  
9 DECISION POINT. I ACTUALLY APPRECIATE THE WAY STAFF HAS  
10 STRUCTURED THIS BECAUSE I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT FOR US TO  
11 UNDERSTAND EACH OF THESE DECISION POINTS BUT AT THE END  
12 KNOWING WHERE WE ARE FOR THE FIRST DECISION POINT I THINK THE  
13 MAJORITY SAID NO AND THEY WERE STILL ON DECISION POINT NUMBER  
14 2, THAT ONCE WE GO THROUGH THE DECISION CONSENSUS POINTS, WHAT  
15 THAT LOOKS LIKE. THAT'S WHAT I WOULD APPRECIATE. IN THE END  
16 ASKING WHAT THAT REALLY MEANS WHEN YOU PUT ALL THOSE THREE  
17 TOGETHER LET'S REVISIT DECISION POINT NUMBER TWO. THAT'S MY  
18 COMMENT AND FEEDBACK. THANK YOU.

19

20 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** MAYBE IF I COULD COMMENT ON THAT. SO I  
21 APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT WE'RE ASKING YOU -- WE SORT OF SET  
22 THE SPECIFIC DECISION POINT, AND IT IS CHALLENGING BECAUSE ALL  
23 THIS INFORMATION IS RELATED. I UNDERSTAND THAT. SO WHAT WE'RE  
24 TRYING TO DO HERE WAS ASK FOR NOT NECESSARILY ON EACH METRIC  
25 THAT WE'RE USING, SO THE QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES WE'RE

August 28, 2020

1 REFERENCING ARE THE FIVE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES. I THINK THE  
2 QUESTION IS, DOES THIS SEEM LIKE GENERALLY THE RIGHT METRICS  
3 TO EVALUATE THESE OPTIONS, AND KNOWING SORT OF THAT QUESTION  
4 CAN INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION ABOUT WHICH METHODOLOGY OPTION  
5 WORKS BEST AND WHAT YOU CAN SEE, I THINK, SEVERAL SPEAKERS  
6 HAVE BROUGHT UP THIS, SOME OF THE METHODOLOGY OPTIONS  
7 PERFORMED BETTER ON SOME KINDS OF METRICS AND OTHERS PERFORMED  
8 BETTER ON OTHER KINDS OF METRICS AND I THINK THAT -- AS I  
9 MENTIONED, THE BALANCING QUESTION IS WHAT'S BEFORE YOU IN  
10 TERMS OF DEVELOPING A SPECIFIC METHODOLOGY OPTION. SO AGAIN I  
11 THINK WE'RE TRYING TO HELP NARROW SORT OF SOME OF THE  
12 DECISIONS, SO THERE IS NOT SO MANY THINGS ON THE TABLE. BUT I  
13 ALSO THINK IT'S, YOU KNOW, LIKE WE HAVE SAID, THESE ARE NOT  
14 BINDING DECISIONS SO IF YOU KIND OF GET TO THE END AND YOU  
15 REALIZE THAT, AFTER ALL OF THE DISCUSSION, YOU THINK ONE OF  
16 THE B OPTIONS WORKS BETTER THEN THE DECISION ABOUT ADJUSTING  
17 THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS IS SOMETHING THAT WE CAN REVISIT. I  
18 DON'T KNOW IF THAT HELPS REASSURE ANYONE, BUT THAT WAS THE  
19 OVERALL THINKING.

20

21 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS GILLIAN. TAWNY, THEN AARTI.

22

23 **SPEAKER:** YEAH. THANK YOU. SO, I THINK KIND OF GOING ON TO THE  
24 COMMENT THAT GILLIAN JUST MADE IN TERMS OF, YOU KNOW, THESE --  
25 ANY DECISION POINTS WE HAVE MADE, CAN BE REVISITED, I FELT IT

August 28, 2020

1 WAS HELPFUL TO DISCUSS THE METRICS IN TERMS OF -- SO IT SOUNDS  
2 LIKE THIS GROUP IS MOVING AWAY FROM MODERATE AND COMBINING  
3 THAT WITH THE LOWER INCOMING GROUPS, BUT JUST REGARDLESS OF IF  
4 MODERATE IS GROUPED WITH VERY LOW INCOME OR LOW INCOME OR NOT,  
5 HCD WILL BE LOOKING AT THE ALLOCATION OF THE LOWER INCOME  
6 GROUPS. SO I WAS JUST -- THIS COMMENT COMES IN BECAUSE I'M  
7 NOTICING LIKE, FOR EXAMPLE, JUST THE 3B, OR ARE THE B VERSIONS  
8 IT LOOKS LIKE THOSE METRICS ARE INCLUDING THE MODERATE INTO  
9 THAT. AND SO JUST -- IT MAY -- THAT MAY OVERSTATE HOW  
10 EQUITABLE THE APPROACH IS FOR THE LOWER INCOME GROUPS. AND SO  
11 I'M NOT SURE IF I'M SEEING THAT ACCURATELY THAT, WHEN YOU'RE  
12 EVALUATING FOR THE METRICS WITH THE B ALTERNATIVE AND MODERATE  
13 IS INCLUDED ARE THOSE MODERATE UNITS EVALUATED FOR IN TERMS OF  
14 IT BEING EQUITABLE? SO I WANT TO CAUTION IF THAT'S TRUE THEN  
15 IT MAY BE MORE HELPFUL TO LOOK AT THE A EVALUATIONS, IF THAT'S  
16 NARROWS DOWN MORE TO WHERE LOW AND VERY LOW INCOME IS.

17

18 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION. SO ARE  
19 YOU SAYING THAT -- MAYBE YOU CAN JUST STATE THAT AGAIN.

20

21 **SPEAKER:** SURE. WHY DON'T WE JUST GO TO SLIDE 18 AND MAYBE THIS  
22 WILL -- THIS IS ONE WAY TO ILLUSTRATE IT. WHEN YOU'RE LOOKING  
23 AT OPTION 1, 2, AND 3, THE "A" VERSION, WE'RE LOOKING AT LOW  
24 AND VERY LOW IN CALCULATION. WHEN YOU'RE LOOK AT "B" VERSION

August 28, 2020

1 OF 1, 2, AND 3, ARE YOU THEN ADDING IN THE MODERATE INCOME  
2 INTO HOW IT'S SCORING FOR THE LOWER INCOME UNITS?

3

4 **AKSEL OLSEN:** THE METRICS IS THE SAME REGARDLESS OF THE  
5 METHODOLOGY.

6

7 **SPEAKER:** SO IF YOU COMPARE 1A FOR AX AMPLE TO 1B, YOU HAVE  
8 DIFFERENT OUTCOMES FOR METRIC 1A TOO SO LIKE IN 1A YOU'RE  
9 SHOWING THAT THE TOP 25, IS IT? SORRY, I'M LOOKING OVER MY --  
10 SO IS THE -- SORRY. I WANT TO MAKE SURE -- SO THE 25  
11 JURISDICTION WITH THE OVERALL HIGH COST IS THEN SHOWING LOWER  
12 THAN THE REST OF THE JURISDICTIONS, VERSUS, AND THE 1B  
13 VERSION, IT'S SHOWING THAT THEY'RE KIND OF CLOSER TO THE SAME.  
14 SO THAT'S MY QUESTION. IF THAT'S BECAUSE THE MODERATE UNITS  
15 ARE THEN INCLUDED IN THAT B VERSION AND THAT'S CHANGING WHAT  
16 THAT METRIC LOOKS LIKE. IS THAT MORE CLEAR GILLIAN? OR --

17

18 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** LET ME ANSWER ONE PART OF WHAT I THINK YOU'RE  
19 ASKING WHICH IS, FOR ALL OF THESE -- WHEN YOU SAY HOW DOES IT  
20 DO ON RECEIVING A LARGER PERCENTAGE OF OTHER RHNA AS LOWER  
21 INCOME UNITS THAT METRIC IS ALWAYS MEASURING VERY LOW AND LOW  
22 REGARDLESS OF HOW THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS ARE ALLOCATED IS  
23 THAT WHAT YOU'RE ASKING? EVEN THOUGH THE MODERATE INCOME UNITS  
24 MIGHT BE ALLOCATED USING THE SAME FACTORS AS VERY LOW AND LOW,  
25 THE METRIC -- WHAT THE METRIC IS MEASURING DOESN'T CHANGE IT'S

August 28, 2020

1 JUST VERY LOW AND LOW. LIKE WHAT'S THE PERCENTAGE OF UNIT THAT  
2 IS A JURISDICTION WE SEE IS IN THOSE TWO INCOME CATEGORIES.

3

4 **AKSEL OLSEN:** THE GOALS ARE THE SAME. IN OTHER WORDS.

5

6 **SPEAKER:** IN THAT CASE I WOULD EXPECT THE CHART ON THE RIGHT TO  
7 BE THE SAME FOR OPTION 3A AND 3B. IF IT'S ONLY LOOKING AT VERY  
8 LOW AND LOW. BECAUSE THE MODERATE IS BEING FACTORED IN BUT  
9 YOU'RE SAYING THE METRIC IS ONLY LOOKING AT VERY LOW AND LOW,  
10 SO I'M NOT SURE WHY THAT CHART WOULD CHANGE IF YOU'RE USING  
11 THE SAME FACTORS AND YOU'RE NOT LOOKING AT MODERATE.

12

13 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** THE CHART ON THE LEFT COMPARED TO THE CHART ON  
14 THE RIGHT?

15

16 **SPEAKER:** NO. THE CHARTS ON THE RIGHT REGARDLESS OF THE SIDE,  
17 BUT THE TOP VERSUS THE BOTTOM. LOOKING AT THE "A" VERSION  
18 WHERE YOU'RE NOT ADDING ANY MODERATE. AND LOOKING AT THE  
19 [INDISCERNIBLE] VERSION WHERE YOU ARE ADDING IN MODERATE.

20

21 **AKSEL OLSEN:** THE DIFFERENCE IS BECAUSE THE ALLOCATION FOR THE  
22 REGION HAS A DIFFERENT DISTRIBUTION SO WHEN WE LOOK AT THE  
23 TYPES OF CITIES THAT GROW A LITTLE BIT MORE, THE DISTRIBUTION  
24 IS DIFFERENT TO BEGIN WITH, AND SO THEREFORE THE METRICS COME

August 28, 2020

1 OUT A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY BECAUSE THE GROWTH DISTRIBUTION IS  
2 DIFFERENT. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

3

4 **SPEAKER:** OKAY BECAUSE YOU'RE LOOKING AT THE TOTAL NUMBER. AND  
5 THE TOTAL NUMBER IS BIGGER.

6

7 **AKSEL OLSEN:** YEAH. ON THE RIGHT.

8

9 **SPEAKER:** OKAY. THANK YOU.

10

11 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** ALL RIGHT. ARE WE ALL SQUARED AWAY ON THAT?  
12 LOOK TO AARTI, JEFF.

13

14 **AARTI SHRIVASTAVA:** I JUST HAVE TO SAY, THIS IS VERY  
15 COMPLICATED, BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO ROLL MY MIND AROUND ON  
16 REPLACING LOWER INCOME WITH ALL UNITS, RIGHT? THROUGHOUT THE  
17 MAP FACTORS. AND I'M LOOKING AT THE PERFORMANCE METRICS,  
18 LOOKING AT ALL THE PERFORMANCE METRICS, AND I JUST HAVE TO --  
19 I JUST HAVE TO SAY, I'M -- ALL ADMIRATION FOR THE WORK YOU  
20 GUYS HAVE DONE, BUT IF I JUST TACK A CURSORY LOOK, I WOULD BE  
21 OPEN TO USING THE COMPREHENSIVE METRICS IF WE USE THE THREE  
22 FACTOR APPROACH. THAT'S THE CONCLUSION I'M COMING TO WHICH IS  
23 WHY I'M SAYING I NEED TO KNOW WHAT THREE IS BEFORE I COULD  
24 SUPPORT TWO.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. I YOU THINK JEFF THEN FERNANDO.

2

3 **JEFF LEVIN:** I WANT TO SPEAK TO THE METRIC ON AFFIRMATIVELY  
4 FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING AND I'M LOOKING AT SLIDE 25. I THINK  
5 SLIDE 25 METRIC 5B IS ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTION: DO THE  
6 JURISDICTION REPRESENTING RACIAL AND ECONOMIC EXCLUSION  
7 RECEIVE ALLOCATIONS THAT ARE AT LEAST PROPORTIONAL THEIR SHARE  
8 OF HOUSEHOLDS. I THINK THIS NEEDS A BIT OF FINE TUNING, AND  
9 THERE IS SORT OF MULTIPLE QUESTIONS WE'RE GETTING AT HERE. ONE  
10 IS HOW DO WE DEFINE WHAT IS AN EXCLUSIONARY JURISDICTION?  
11 SECONDLY, HOW DO WE DECIDE IF A CITY IS OR ISN'T GETTING ITS  
12 FAIR SHARE TO ADDRESS THOSE PAST INEQUITIES AND THE THIRD IS,  
13 WHAT DOES IT MEAN, WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS IF A CITY DOESN'T  
14 SCORE HIGHLY ON THAT? SO, ON THE FIRST POINT, AND TO ECHO WHAT  
15 RUBY SAID, I THINK IDEALLY WE WOULD BE USING A METRIC THAT  
16 LOOKS DIRECTLY AT RACIAL EXCLUSION. SEVERAL OF US SUBMITTED A  
17 LETTER THAT'S IN THE PUBLIC COMMENT SECTION TODAY SUGGESTING  
18 THAT WHAT WE REALLY OUGHT TO BE USING IS PLACES THAT HAVE  
19 BELOW AVERAGE SHARES OF BLACK AND LATIN X POPULATIONS BEING  
20 COMBINED WITH HIGH INCOME IF WE LOOK AT HOW THAT IF I RECALLS  
21 OUT IT CAPTURES A LOT OF THE CITIES AS WE THINK AS BEING  
22 EXCLUSIONARY. BUT AT A MINIMUM, I THINK WE NEED TO MAKE SURE  
23 THAT WE'RE USING A METRIC THAT CAPTURES MORE THAN A SMALL  
24 SLIVER OF THE TOTAL POPULATION AND THE TOTAL ALLOCATION. SO I  
25 SHARE THE CONCERN THAT JUST TAKING THE QUOTE "TOP 25 CITIES"

August 28, 2020

1 MIGHT NOT MOVE THE NEEDLE VERY MUCH. I MAY NOT BE ASKING THE  
2 RIGHT QUESTION. AND I THINK I'LL LEAVE IT TO OTHERS TO SUGGEST  
3 SOME ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF DOING THAT. ON THE MEASURE OF FAIR  
4 SHARE, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD BE LOOKING AT THE TOTAL  
5 ALLOCATION. WE SHOULD BE LOOKING AT WHETHER SPECIFICALLY THE  
6 ALLOCATION OF VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME FOR A JURISDICTION IS  
7 PROPORTIONAL TO ITS 2019 HOUSEHOLD SHARE. AND THE REASON IS,  
8 THAT THE PRINCIPLE ISSUE OR EXCLUSION HAS BEEN THE  
9 PREDOMINANCE OF SINGLE FAMILY ZONING IN SOME PLACES AND THE  
10 LACK OF MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING. AND A BARRIER SPECIFICALLY TO  
11 AFFORDABLE HOUSING THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTS PEOPLE OF  
12 COLOR. SO, I WOULD REALLY WANT US TO LOOK SPECIFICALLY AT  
13 WHETHER VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME SHARES ARE PROPORTIONAL OR  
14 NOT, AND NOT THE OVERALL TOTAL. AND THEN, THIRD, RIGHT NOW,  
15 THIS PERFORMANCE METRIC IS LOOKING AT A SET OF CITIES IN THE  
16 AGGREGATE, AND I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT BECAUSE WHAT THAT  
17 MAY BE DOING IS SAYING, SOME CITIES ARE GOING TO PERFORM  
18 REALLY WELL, AND OTHER CITIES AREN'T, BUT IT AVERAGES OUT, AND  
19 IT MEANS THAT CERTAIN EXCLUSIONARY JURISDICTION CONTINUE TO BE  
20 EXCLUSIONARY JURISDICTION, ARE AND THEN WE'RE NOT REALLY  
21 ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVE OF BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS AND  
22 AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING. AND SO I REALLY THINK  
23 WE NEED TO LOOK AT INDIVIDUAL CITIES AND, YOU KNOW, TRYING TO  
24 ENSURE THAT FOR THE CITIES THAT WE IDENTIFY AS BEING  
25 EXCLUSIONARY, THAT EVERY ONE OF THEM IS AT LEAST GETTING A

August 28, 2020

1 PROPORTIONAL SHARE OF VERY LOW AND LOW WHICH THEN WOULD  
2 REQUIRE THEM TO DO MORE ZONING ON MULTI-FAMILY BECAUSE THE  
3 HOUSING ELEMENT WOULD SPECIFICALLY HAVE TO IDENTIFY SITES  
4 ZONED AT DENSITIES OF 20 TO 30 UNITS PER ACRE. SO I REALLY  
5 WOULD LIKE TO SEE US DRILL DOWN MORE AND CONSIDER WHETHER WE  
6 MIGHT HAVE TO ADJUST THE ALLOCATIONS IF ON THIS METRIC WE  
7 DON'T GET TO WHERE WE WANT TO BE.

8

9 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** STAFF RESPONSE TO THAT? THEN WE'LL MOVE ON TO  
10 FERNANDO. FERNANDO YOU'RE UP.

11

12 **FERNANDO MARTI:** I WAS ECHOING. I WAS ONE OF THE SIGNATORIES  
13 WITH JEFF ON THAT LETTER. ON WHAT RUBY AND JEFF HAS SAID. ONE  
14 OF THE THINGS AS A DATA POINT THEY THINK WOULD BE IMPORTANT TO  
15 UNDERSTAND IS, WHAT PERCENT OF THE POPULATION IS THIS  
16 PARTICULAR METRIC CAPTURING. SO IN OUR LETTER WE REFERENCED  
17 STUDIES THAT LOOKED AT THE CITIES, SORT OF THE JURISDICTION  
18 THAT HAVE EXHIBITED THIS SORT OF EXCLUSIONARY, CALL IT VERY  
19 BROADLY, EXCLUSIONARY, BEING SORT OF COMPOSING ABOUT 40  
20 PERCENT OF THE BAY AREA, IN POPULATION, SO WHEN YOU SAY THE 25  
21 PERCENT IN THE TOP SEAS, IS THAT 12 PERCENT OF FOLKS? YOU  
22 KNOW, WHAT, WHERE ARE THEY? WE DID SOME RESEARCH BUT IT'S  
23 LOOKING TO US LIKE 12 PERCENT WHAT'S ACTUALLY CAPTURED. SO I  
24 THINK THAT'S A QUESTION, THEN, ABOUT, IS THE METRIC THAT WE'RE  
25 USING IN ORDER TO MEET OBJECTIVE FIVE, THE CORRECT ONE? AND WE

August 28, 2020

1 PROPOSED A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT WAYS OF LOOKING AT THIS. SO,  
2 YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE WAYS THAT THAT COULD BE DONE IS RATHER  
3 THAN HOW I UNDERSTAND IT IS, OTHER THAN SORT OF A WHERE WE'RE  
4 EXPERIENCING BOTH DIVERGENCE AND HIGH INCOME, HOW DO WE ADD  
5 THOSE TOGETHER TO CREATE A COMPOSITE SCORE THAT BROADENS THE  
6 NUMBER OF CITIES THAT WE'RE CAPTURING? THEN WE SEE THAT, WHICH  
7 CITIES ARE BEING LEFT OUT. BECAUSE I THINK, INTUITIVELY WE  
8 KIND OF KNOW WHERE WE SHOULD BE. SO I THINK THAT'S SORT OF A  
9 DATA POINT IN TERMS OF TRYING TO MOVE FORWARD ON OBJECTIVE  
10 FIVE, AND PERHAPS THINKING ABOUT A DIFFERENT WAY OF MEASURING  
11 THOSE OUTCOMES. FINALLY, I THINK, AS JEFF SAID, WHAT IS THE --  
12 HAVING TALKED ABOUT, OR SHOULD WE TALK ABOUT, WHAT IS THE  
13 CONSEQUENCE WHEN WE'RE NOT MEETING SOME OF THOSE OBJECTIVES?  
14 THERE IS -- IS THERE A SENSE THAT, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE LAID OUT,  
15 HOWEVER WE END UP WITH A LIST OF JURISDICTION THAT MEET THESE  
16 OBJECTIVES, BUT THE CHOSEN METHODOLOGY MAYBE CAPTURES HALF OF  
17 THOSE, LET'S SAY, AS AN EXAMPLE, IS THERE A WAY TO GO BACK AND  
18 CAPTURE THE OTHER HALF THAT'S SOME KIND OF BASELINE, YOU KNOW,  
19 I THINK WE HAVE PROPOSED THAT YOU HAVE GOT SORT OF A, FOR THE  
20 LOW INCOME AND VERY LOW INCOME, WE WANT TO AT LEAST MEET THE  
21 SHARE OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THOSE CITIES. SO THEY'RE NOT GETTING  
22 LESS THAN YOUR PROPORTIONAL SHARE FOR THOSE CITIES LIKE WE  
23 HAVE IDENTIFIED AS NEEDING TO MEET THE OBJECTIVES OF OBJECTIVE  
24 FIVE.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** SO I THINK BEFORE WE MOVE ON I THINK IT MIGHT  
2 BE FOR MATT LAVRINETS TO WEIGH IN ON THE QUESTION MEASURING A  
3 QUESTION THAT SPECIFICALLY TARGETS THAN IN THE DIVERGENT INDEX  
4 WE HAVE BEEN USING SO FAR TO MEASURE SEGREGATION.

5

6 **MATTHEW LAVRINETS:** THANKS GILLIAN. I WOULD SAY ANY TIME YOU'RE  
7 MAKING POLICY BASED ON A SPECIFIC, CALLING OUT RACE OR  
8 FOCUSING ON A SPECIFIC ETHNIC GROUP THAT POSSESSES SOME RISK.  
9 AND I THINK HMC SHOULD BE CAREFUL ABOUT DOING THAT  
10 PARTICULARLY WHEN THERE ARE SORT OF NON-RACIAL WAYS OF  
11 ACCOMPLISHING THE SAME GOAL. SO AGAIN JUST SOMETHING THAT THE  
12 HMC SHOULD BE AWARE OF AND THERE IS POTENTIAL LEGAL HURDLES TO  
13 DOING THAT AND MAY INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE  
14 METHODOLOGY WOULD BE SUBJECT TO A LEGAL CHALLENGE.

15

16 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. DIANE, JAMES, CARLOS.

17

18 **DIANE DILLON:** I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ECHO AARTI'S SUGGESTION. I  
19 THINK WE NEED TO MOVE TO THE FACTORS PLEASE. THANKS.

20

21 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** JAMES?

22

23 **JAMES PAPPAS:** YEAH. I'LL BE HONEST. I THINK I'M STRUGGLING A  
24 BIT CONCEPTUALLY WITH THIS BECAUSE IT FEELS LIKE WE'RE  
25 CHOOSING HOW TO GRADE OURSELVES, BEFORE WE DO THE WORK, AND I

August 28, 2020

1 WOULD LOVE IT IF -- AND I GET IT, IF THE STATUS ARE NOT CLEAR  
2 ENOUGH, IS WHAT I'M GETTING FROM THIS IS TO HAVE A  
3 STANDARDIZED WAY TO EVALUATE THESE THINGS, THAT STAFF CAN JUST  
4 COME AND SAY, HERE ARE THE THINGS WE HAVE TO HIT TO SHOW THAT  
5 WE'RE MEETING THE FIVE OBJECTIVES, BUT THAT TO ME WOULD BE  
6 IDEAL. BECAUSE IT DOESN'T REALLY FEEL APPROPRIATE FOR US TO BE  
7 PLAYING WITH THE WAY WE GRADE OURSELVES TO THEN YOU KNOW, GET  
8 THE -- TO THEN BE ABLE TO CHOOSE THE FACTORS AND THEN SAY  
9 WE'RE DOING GREAT ON OUR OBJECTIVES BECAUSE THEN WE'RE  
10 CHOOSING THE WAY WE'RE GRADING OURSELVES. TO THE POINTS THEY  
11 HAVE HEARD SO FAR BECAUSE IT SEEMS LIKE WE DO HAVE TO CHOOSE  
12 THE WAY TO GRADE OURSELVES BECAUSE IT SEEMS LIKE THERE IS NO  
13 CLEAR STANDARD IN STATE LAW FOR HOW TO DO IT, I THINK  
14 EVERYTHING THEY HAVE HEARD FROM RUBY AND JEFF, AND FERNANDO, I  
15 -- IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT REALLY IS ABOUT THE NUMBER EVER  
16 UNITS, AND SO TO ME, MANY OF THESE FACTORS ABOUT UNITS IN  
17 CITIES SHOWING GREATER EXCLUSION CAN BE MEASURED BY INCOME,  
18 AND I WOULD NOTE, AT THE CONVERSATION ABOUT RACE, WE DID HAVE  
19 THE DIVERGENCE INDEX AS ONE OF THE POTENTIAL FACTORS WHICH I  
20 THINK DOES TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCE OF A  
21 CITY RELATIVE TO THE REGION, AND SO CITIES THAT ARE MORE  
22 EXCLUSIVELY ONE RACE OR ANOTHER WOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THAT, I  
23 DON'T KNOW THAT MANY OF US LOVED THAT FACTOR, BUT ANYWAY,  
24 THERE IS SOMETHING THERE THAT WE COULD CONSIDER. I THINK  
25 INCOME IS THE LEADING FACTOR, AND HIGH HOUSING COST I THINK

August 28, 2020

1 WERE LISTED IN THERE, I WOULD SAY THAT THE NUMBERS OF UNITS  
2 NEED TO NOT ONLY BE PROPORTIONAL, BUT POTENTIALLY LARGER. SO  
3 MINIMUM PROPORTIONAL AND POTENTIALLY LARGER, I THINK SHOULD BE  
4 ADDED TO THOSE FACTORS. BECAUSE I THINK WE MIGHT POTENTIALLY  
5 WANT MORE UNITS IN THESE PLACES THAT ARE MORE EXPENSIVE, HAVE  
6 FEWER LOW INCOME PEOPLE AND ARE OTHERWISE MORE EXCLUSIONARY.  
7 AND THAT SEEMS LIKE ONE OF THE MAIN THINGS WE'RE TRYING TO  
8 ACHIEVE SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY WITH THIS PROCESS. BUT IF  
9 IT'S A WAY TO GIVE US AN OBJECTIVE WAY TO DO THIS. [LAUGHTER]  
10 OBJECTIVE, OBJECTIVES THAT ARE -- IN CHOOSING HOW TO GRADE  
11 OURSELVES, THAT WOULD BE WONDERFUL.

12

13 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** TO CLARIFY, IT'S TRUE WE ARE TRYING TO THINK  
14 ABOUT WHAT ARE THE BEST MEASURES OF WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO MEET  
15 THESE OBJECTIVES OR FURTHER THE OBJECTIVES. PURPOSE FOR HAVING  
16 US LOOK AT THE METRICS THEMSELVES BEFORE DIVING INTO EACH OF  
17 THE METHODOLOGY OPTIONS WAS THAT THE METRIC AND EVALUATION,  
18 AND THE ANALYSIS CAN SORT OF INFORM YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT  
19 METHODOLOGY OPTIONS SO TO JAMES'S POINT ABOUT WHICH ONES -- IF  
20 YOU THINK SOME OF THEM SHOULD BE MORE THAN PROPORTIONAL, SOME  
21 OF THESE BARELY COME UP TO PROPORTIONAL AND SOME ARE MUCH MORE  
22 PROPORTIONAL THAN OTHERS, SO I'M -- I GUESS I'M JUST TRYING TO  
23 EXPLAIN WHERE THE SORT OF FLOW WAS TO DO THIS THIS WAY, AND  
24 IT'S LESS ABOUT TRYING TO USE IT AS A METRICS TO MAKE OUR  
25 OPTIONS LOOK GOOD BUT TO HELP YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON

August 28, 2020

1 WITH THE OPTIONS AS A WAY OF INFORMING THE COORDINATION ABOUT  
2 WHICH OPTIONS YOU LIKE BEST.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** CARLOS, I THINK I LOWERED YOUR HAND BEFORE YOU  
5 SPOKE. DID YOU HAVE A COMMENT?

6

7 **CARLOS ROMERO:** YES. HELLO?

8

9 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** GO FOR IT.

10

11 **CARLOS ROMERO:** OKAY. SO I WANT TO ECHO AND THEN BUILD ON, I  
12 THINK, JAMES'S AND RUBY'S COMMENTS. AND ACTUALLY PROPOSE  
13 ANOTHER WAY OF DOING THIS. I HEAR LEGAL COUNSEL'S ADVICE,  
14 ADMONITION, THERE MAY BE OTHER ACCOUNTS WHERE THEY SAY IT'S  
15 NOT CHALLENGING IN COURT BUT TO BRING ANOTHER CASE. IF WE  
16 EXCLUDE, BLACK, BROWN, LATINO, LATINA TERMS, WE COULD  
17 POTENTIALLY USE, AND I'M PROPOSING, THE DIVERGENT INDEX WHICH  
18 WE HAVE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT, RIGHT, AND WE HAVE VETTED, AND  
19 PERHAPS INCLUDE IN THAT A COMPOSITE SCORE THAT ALSO INCLUDES A  
20 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT ARE ABOVE MODERATE INCOME FOR EACH  
21 JURISDICTION. AND THEN, OF COURSE, WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT THIS  
22 OTHER PIECE, WE WOULD HAVE TO DO SOME ADJUSTMENT ON THE BACK  
23 END WHICH IS FILTERING OUT THOSE CITIES WITH THE LOWEST  
24 QUARTILE OF MEDIAN INCOME. SO THAT WE DON'T WIND UP KIND OF,  
25 YOU KNOW, BURDENING THESE OTHER LOWER INCOME COMMUNITIES THAT,

August 28, 2020

1 WHEN WHAT WE'RE REALLY TRYING DO IS MAKE SURE THAT THOSE  
2 EXCLUSIONARY COMMUNITIES OR CITIES ABSOLUTELY GET A FAIR SHARE  
3 OR AS JAMES WAS SAYING, EVEN A GREATER SHARE OF THEIR -- OF  
4 THE LOW INCOME AND VERY LOW INCOME UNITS. SO, I THINK THAT  
5 WOULD BE MY KIND OF COMPROMISE FOR THIS OBJECTIVE TO TRY TO  
6 CAPTURE WHAT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED HERE. BY THOSE -- I THINK  
7 THOSE PREVIOUS FOUR PRESENTERS. AND AGAIN IT WOULD BE  
8 IMPORTANT TO MAKE ADJUSTMENTS TO ENSURE KIND OF  
9 PROPORTIONALITY, IN TERMS OF THE VLILI NUMBERS FOR THESE  
10 CITIES. SO, I THINK THAT I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT AS A  
11 SUBSTITUTE AND CRITERIA FOR 5B.

12

13 **AKSEL OLSEN:** CAN I SAY, KIND OF THE MEASURE THE WAY IT'S  
14 CURRENTLY SET UP IS A COMP COMPOSITE, WE TAKE THE UPPER HALF  
15 OF TERMS OF INDEX AND UPPER HALF IN TERMS OF CITY INCOMES AND  
16 IF IT FALLS IN THOSE BUCKETS AT THE SAME TIME THEN IT MEETS A  
17 CUT OFF SO WE DON'T NEED TO MEASURE TO CUT OFF THE BOTTOM.  
18 BOTH CONDITIONS HAVE TO BE TRUE FOR US TO COUNT IT AS  
19 EXCLUSIONARY IT NEEDS TO BE YOU WERE INCOME AND SEGREGATED.  
20 THAT BECOMES THE UNIVERSE OF CITIES WE'RE LOOKING AT WHEN WE  
21 EVALUATE 5C AND WHERE THE ALLOCATIONS ARE SET. SO IN A SENSE  
22 IT KIND OF DOES THAT ALREADY.

23

24 **CARLOS ROMERO:** IS IT ACTUALLY A COMPOSITE SCORE WHERE THE  
25 DIVERGENT INDEX PIECE GIVES YOU A NUMBER AND THEN THE PERCENT

August 28, 2020

1 HOUSEHOLDS ABOVE MODERATE INCOME GIVES YOU ANOTHER YOU COMBINE  
2 THOSE TWO AND IF IT'S OVER THE -- A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE,  
3 WHETHER IT'S ONE -- I DON'T KNOW HOW WE WEIGHED IT, THAN THOSE  
4 JURISDICTION, YOU KNOW, FAIL TO MEET THE METRICS?

5

6 **AKSEL OLSEN:** WELL IT'S -- YEAH, IT'S SORT OF LIKE TWO SEPARATE  
7 CHECKS, DOES THE CITY FALL TO THE TOP IN TERMS OF DIVERGENCE  
8 OR THE SEGREGATION SCORE AND DOES IT ALSO AT THE SAME TIME  
9 FALL TO THE TOP OF THIS OTHER ONE SO IF IT'S IN BOTH THOSE TWO  
10 UNIVERSES IF IT'S IN THE VENDI PROGRAM, THOSE ARE EVALUATION  
11 TERMS. SO IT'S A CONSENSUS OF MULTIPLICATION IT'S LOGICAL IN  
12 THAT IT NEEDS TO BE ON BOTH THE LISTS TO COUNT IT AS A CITY,  
13 THE TOP 25 OR 31 IN THIS CASE.

14

15 **CARLOS ROMERO:** I THINK THERE ARE SOME CITIES THAT ARE HIGH ON  
16 THE DIVERGENCE INDEX, BUT NOT ON THE INCOME AND VICE-VERSA,  
17 BUT I MAY LEAVE IT TO OTHER COLLEAGUES FOR THEM TO EXPOUND ON  
18 THIS KIND OF COMPROMISE I'M COMING UP WITH. THANK YOU. THANK  
19 YOU.

20

21 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS CARLOS. OKAY. I SEE A BUNCH OF HANDS UP  
22 AND I UNDERSTAND YOU ALL WANT TO WEIGH IN ON THIS BUT GIVING  
23 THE TIMING WE WANT TO GET TO TALKING ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY  
24 TODAY AHEAD OF THE SEPTEMBER MEETING. WE COULD MOVE TO A  
25 DECISION POINT ON THE PERFORMANCE METRICS IF YOU WANTED TO OAR

August 28, 2020

1 WE COULD PAUSE THE CONVERSATION AND RETURN TO IT IN SEPTEMBER.  
2 IT'S SORT OF UP TO YOU ALL. I'M NOT HEARING ANYONE SAYING,  
3 LIKE, YES, I LOVE THEM JUST AS THEY ARE. BUT MAYBE THAT'S JUST  
4 BECAUSE WE'RE DEEP IN THE DETAILS. SO IF ANYONE -- I GUESS IF  
5 ANYONE HAS A VERY STRONG FEELING ABOUT, YOU KNOW, THEY THINK  
6 WE HAVE CONSENSUS ON THE EXPANDED PERFORMANCE METRICS, WE CAN  
7 GO AHEAD AND DO A DECISION POINT, AND IF NOT, I THINK WE CAN  
8 JUST MOVE TO THE LAST PART OF OUR CONVERSATION, WHICH IS SORT  
9 OF DIVING INTO THOSE METHODOLOGIES AND TALKING THROUGH THE  
10 OPTIONS.

11

12 **SPEAKER:** DON'T YOU THINK IT'S WORTH PUTTING UP THE CARDS ON  
13 DECISION POINTS TO GET A SENSE OF WHERE WE ARE?

14

15 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** YEAH. MORE THAN HAPPY TO DO THAT. I THINK WE  
16 CAN MOVE QUICKLY TO PUBLIC COMMENT.

17

18 **JULIE PIERCE:** CAN I ASK A QUESTION FIRST?

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** SURE.

21

22 **JULIE PIERCE:** I DON'T SEE THAT WE LACK MEETING ANY OF THESE  
23 METRICS. I MEAN, WE MEET THEM TO AN EXACT OR ANOTHER. AND SO I  
24 AGREE WITH THOSE WHO THINK WE OUGHT TO GO TO QUESTION THREE,  
25 BECAUSE WE, DEPENDING ON WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO MEET, ALL OF

August 28, 2020

1 THESE THINGS MEET THE CRITERIA. RIGHT? OR AM I MISSING  
2 SOMETHING? ALL OF THESE METRICS MEET TO ONE EXTENT OR ANOTHER  
3 THE GOALS THAT WE HAVE SET OUT. AND SO IT'S AN OPINION ISSUE  
4 ON WHICH METRICS ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT. AND FOR SOME, ONE  
5 METRIC WILL BE MORE IMPORTANT THAN ANOTHER. BUT WE MEET THEM  
6 ALL, TO AN EXTENT OR ANOTHER. SO I GUESS THE BIGGEST QUESTION,  
7 WHICH GOES TO QUESTION THREE, IS, HOW FAR TOWARD MEETING  
8 EVERYTHING CAN WE GO IN ONE STEP, IN ONE CYCLE? BECAUSE I  
9 THINK THERE IS A POINT WHERE YOU CAN ASK TOO MUCH OF SOME,  
10 WHERE YOU'RE REALLY NOT GOING TO GET ANYWHERE CLOSE. AND SO WE  
11 NEED TO LOOK AT THE BROADER VISION AND I THINK IT'S WHAT ELISE  
12 PUT IN THE CHAT A WHILE GO IN MEETING THE THREE POINTS. IT'S  
13 REALLY ABOUT WHAT OUR REGIONAL GROWTH PATTERN NEEDS TO LOOK  
14 LIKE. ARE WE MEETING THE EQUITY STANDARDS. THAT KIND OF THING.  
15 AND YOU CAN READ THROUGH HER COMMENTS SHE STATED IT FAR BETTER  
16 THAN I AM. BUT I THINK WE NEED TO REMEMBER WE CAN'T DO IT ALL  
17 IN ONE WEEK. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE NEXT EIGHT YEARS HERE. WE  
18 ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE NEXT 30 YEARS. SO YES, IT WOULD BE  
19 NICE TO MAKE INROADS ON ALL OF THESE THINGS, BUT I THINK WE  
20 HAVE JUST PROVEN WITH THESE METRICS THAT WE MAKE BIG INROADS  
21 ON EVERY ONE. SOME A LITTLE BETTER THAN OTHERS. SO, LET'S GO  
22 TO ITEM THREE.

23

24 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** ALL RIGHT CAN WE TAKE A QUICK MINUTE TO SEE IF  
25 WE HAVE CONSENSUS ON THE PERFORMANCE METRICS? I THINK FRED AND

August 28, 2020

1 CHAIR ARREGUIN CAN DO A QUICK PUBLIC COMMENT AHEAD OF THE  
2 DECISION POINT.

3

4 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I HAVE HEARD TWO THINGS. A DESIRE TO  
5 TAKE A TEMPERATURE CHECK AND A DESIRE TO GO TO NUMBER THREE  
6 AND I GUESS MY QUESTION FOR GILLIAN IS, DO WE HAVE TO VOTE  
7 NOW? IT SEEMS THAT THE DECISION WE MAKE ON NUMBER THREE WILL  
8 PROBABLY INFORM THE EVALUATION CRITERIA.

9

10 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** UM --

11

12 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** IS THREE THE MORE IMPORTANT AREA YOU  
13 NEED GUIDANCE ON TODAY?

14

15 **GILLIAN ADAMS:** I DON'T KNOW THAT THE DECISIONS ON NUMBER THREE  
16 ARE GOING TO INFORM THE EVALUATION CRITERIA, BUT I THINK THE  
17 DECISION ON NUMBER THREE IS A CONVERSATION ABOUT BUILDING THE  
18 METHODOLOGY. SO, AGAIN, WE WERE TRYING TO GET TO SOME  
19 EVALUATION METRICS THAT WE THOUGHT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO YOU IN  
20 TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW YOU WANT TO BUILD THE METHODOLOGY, OR  
21 KIND OF WHICH AREAS MAY NEED TWEAKING OR WHICH OF THOSE THREE  
22 OPTIONS YOU FEEL WE SHOULD SPEND THE MOST TIME ON, IN OUR  
23 DISCUSSIONS. SO AS STAFF, I HEAR THAT THERE IS A LOT OF  
24 DIFFERENT OPTIONS, AND I DO HEAR THERE IS QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW  
25 WE CAN CHANGE THE EVALUATION METRICS BUT I DON'T SEE THAT

August 28, 2020

1 WE'RE GOING TO GET CLARITY ON THAT IN THIS MEETING BUT IT  
2 WOULD BE HELPFUL TO MOVE TO THREE SO WE CAN GET TO WHAT IT IS  
3 YOU NEED FROM STAFF ABOUT THOSE OPTIONS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE A  
4 DECISION. AND IF FOLKS WHO HAVE DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT THE  
5 METRICS THAT WE SHOULD BE RUNNING, YOU KNOW, MAYBE WE CAN WORK  
6 TOGETHER TO PRESENT AN EVEN WIDER SET OF METRICS AT THE LAST  
7 MEETING AND I'M NOT QUITE SURE HOW TO HANDLE THAT, BUT I THINK  
8 NUMBER THREE IS MORE IMPORTANT AT THIS POINT.

9

10 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** AMBER, I THINK THAT'S A BETTER  
11 APPROACH. I THINK WE SHOULD GO TO NUMBER THREE. I KNOW THERE  
12 ARE SEVERAL PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD BY EVALUATION METRICS AND IF  
13 PEOPLE CAN PROVIDE THOSE SUGGESTIONS TO STAFF MAYBE WE CAN  
14 HAVE A MORE COMPREHENSIVE DISCUSSION AT OUR NEXT MEETING I  
15 THINK THAT WOULD BE A BETTER WAY TO PROCEED.

16

17 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** FABULOUS. ALL RIGHT SO WE'RE MOVING FORWARD TO  
18 DISCUSSION ON FACTOR AND WEIGHTS AND METHODOLOGY OPTIONS. THAT  
19 GILLIAN INCLUDED IN HER PRESENTATION. WE COULD OPEN IT UP FOR  
20 CLARIFYING QUESTIONS BUT I THINK WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT  
21 GETTING CLARITY THE ENTIRE MEETING SO IF WE COULD JUST MOVE  
22 INTO THE DISCUSSION OF THOSE OPTIONS.

23

24 **FERNANDO MARTI:** [INDISCERNIBLE] ITEM TWO --

25

August 28, 2020

1 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** FERNANDO I'M HAVING A HARD TIME HEARING YOU.

2

3 **FERNANDO MARTI:** I THINK WE HAD A FEW HANDS FOR ITEM TWO.

4

5 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** I THINK THE RECOMMENDATION IS TO LEAVE THE  
6 CONVERSATION ABOUT ITEM TWO OR THE SECOND DECISION POINT UNTIL  
7 NEXT TIME, AND IF YOU HAVE ANYTHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO  
8 SHARE WITH STAFF, YOU COULD PUT IT INTO THE CHAT? OR  
9 COMMUNICATE OUTSIDE OF THE MEETING. SO THAT WE COULD HAVE  
10 CONVERSATION ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY.

11

12 **SPEAKER:** CAN'T WE JUST AT LEAST TAKE A TEMPERATURE CHECK? I  
13 MEAN IT SEEMS WEIRD, OF THE DISCUSSION GOING ON, AND WE DON'T  
14 EVEN -- UNCLEAR, SOME KIND OF CHECK N ARE WE GOOD? ARE WE NOT  
15 GOOD. IT'S KIND OF STRANGE THAT WE'RE NOT EVEN APPROACHING A  
16 QUESTION AS A TEMPERATURE CHECK IF NOT A FINAL DECISION?

17

18 **FERNANDO MARTI:** I THINK THAT WE CERTAINLY HAVE RAISED A  
19 QUESTION AROUND -- SO COME BACK NEXT TIME, I THINK WE COULD  
20 CERTAINLY -- HEAR SOME ALTERNATIVES TO PUT TOGETHER  
21 ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS TO STAFF JUST TON IF ANY OF THE OTHER  
22 VERY SPECIFIC OTHER OBJECTIVES -- REQUEST FROM STAFF TO COME  
23 BACK [INDISCERNIBLE]. FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH OTHER OBJECTIVE  
24 SET FORTH -- FIVE -- [INDISCERNIBLE] NEXT TIME -- BECAUSE  
25 OTHER -- [INDISCERNIBLE]

August 28, 2020

1

2 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** FERNANDO, I HAD A HARD TIME HEARING YOU. BUT I  
3 THINK -- I GUESS I HAVE TO DEFER TO CHAIR HERE.

4

5 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** IT SEEMS THERE IS STILL A DESIRE TO  
6 TALK ABOUT NUMBER TWO, SO IF WE SHOULD TAKE ANY FURTHER  
7 COMMENTS ON THAT.

8

9 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** ALL RIGHT. I SEE JEFF, AARTI AND NELL WITH  
10 THEIR HANDS RAISED.

11

12 **JEFF LEVIN:** THANK YOU. FIRST JUST PROCEDURALLY I WOULD LIKE TO  
13 SEE US TAKE A TEMPERATURE CHECK AS WELL AS HEAR FROM THE  
14 PUBLIC SPEAKERS. I THINK WE SHOULD DO THAT. I THINK I HEARD A  
15 FORMAL PROPOSAL FOR AN ALTERNATIVE METRICS ON FIVE. I DON'T  
16 KNOW IF WE NEED TO VOTE ON THAT. BUT, YOU KNOW, I AM REALLY  
17 CONCERNED ON AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING THAT THE  
18 METRIC WE ARE USING IS LOOKING AT EXCLUSIONARY CITIES IN THE  
19 AGGREGATE, AND WHAT WE ARE SAYING THERE, IS IT IS OKAY FOR  
20 CITY ONE TO BE REALLY OFF AS LONG AS THAT'S OFFSET BY CITY  
21 TWO. AND, THAT'S PROBLEMATIC TO ME. I DON'T THINK WE WANT ANY  
22 OF THE EXCLUSIONARY CITIES TO BE GETTING ALLOCATIONS THAT  
23 AREN'T PROPORTIONAL. IT'S NOT JUST A QUESTION OF HOW THE  
24 EXCLUSIONARY CITIES LOOK IN THE AGGREGATE. THAT'S BEEN OUR  
25 PROBLEM FOR DECADES. SO I REALLY THINK WE NEED TO THINK THAT

August 28, 2020

1 THROUGH A BIT MORE AS WELL AS MAKING SURE THAT WE'RE CAPTURING  
2 THE RIGHT SET. I THINK SOMETHING THAT ONLY CAPTURES 12 PERCENT  
3 OF THE POPULATION IS PROBABLY NOT ASKING A QUESTION IN THE  
4 RIGHT WAY.

5

6 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** DID YOU NOW HAVE A COMMENT?

7

8 **NELL SELANDER:** YEAH. I GUESS WE'RE STILL TALKING ABOUT WHETHER  
9 OR NOT TO TAKE A TEMPERATURE CHECK ON TWO. I HAVE NO PROBLEM  
10 WITH THAT. I HAVE A COMMENT IF WE'RE MOVING ON TO NUMBER THREE  
11 ABOUT THE PREFERRED METHODOLOGY, THE SIX OPTIONS WE HAD THE  
12 HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT ABOUT. SHOULD I MAKE THAT COMMENT NOW? OR

13 --

14

15 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** I THINK -- I THINK YOU SHOULD PROBABLY HOLD  
16 THAT COMMENT, AND WE SHOULD FINISH UP THE SECOND THING.

17

18 **NELL SELANDER:** OKAY.

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** AND THEN MOVE YOU ON TO THAT CONVERSATION AS  
21 QUICKLY AS WE POSSIBLY CAN. I FEEL LIKE IF PEOPLE ARE ASKING  
22 FOR A TEMPERATURE CHECK, WE SHOULD DO IT, AND TAKE SOME PUBLIC  
23 COMMENT AND MOVE AS QUICKLY AS WE CAN. FRED, SORRY TO THROW  
24 THIS TO YOU.

25

**August 28, 2020**

1 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** ARREGUIN, WE WILL PROCEED WITH PUBLIC  
2 COMMENT ON THIS QUESTION?

3

4 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** LET'S TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT AND THIS IS  
5 ON THE EVALUATION CRITERIA. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THIS  
6 ITEM PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND OR PRESS STAR NINE.

7

8 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. FIRST SPEAKER IS RICH HEDGES.  
9 GO AHEAD. MR. HEDGES, PLEASE UNMUTE YOURSELF.

10

11 **RICHARD HEDGES:** SORRY. I HAD TAKEN MY HAND DOWN. I GUESS IT  
12 DIDN'T WORK, LOWERING IT, I APOLOGIZE.

13

14 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. SO OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS AARON  
15 ECKHOUSE. GO AHEAD. AARON ECKHOUSE?

16

17 **SPEAKER:** YES. THANK YOU. SORRY. I HADN'T SEEN -- I WASN'T SEE  
18 THE NOTIFICATION TO UNMUTE. I JUST WANT TO THANK STAFF FOR  
19 BRINGING BACK METRICS TO LOOK AT TOTAL QUANTITY RATHER THAN  
20 PERCENTAGE OF A JURISDICTION'S SHARE. I THINK THOSE ARE GOING  
21 TO BE REALLY HELPFUL AND PROVIDE MUCH HIGHER QUALITY  
22 INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION. I THINK SOME OF THE COMMENTS THAT  
23 HAVE BEEN MADE PARTICULARLY WITH HCD REFINING QUANTITY OF  
24 LOWER INCOME HOUSING FOR THE AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR  
25 HOUSING METRICS THAT MAKES SENSE BUT I'M GLAD TO SEE THERE IS

August 28, 2020

1 GOING TO BE A FOCUS ON TOTAL QUANTITY VERSUS AVERAGE I THINK  
2 THAT'S GOING TO REFLECT WHERE WE WANT TO GET THE PEOPLE  
3 TOWARDS HOUSING. THANK YOU.

4

5 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER IS SHAJUTI  
6 HOSSAIN. GO AHEAD.

7

8 **SPEAKER:** HI I'M SHAJUTI HOSSAIN WITH PUBLIC ADVOCATES. I WANT  
9 TO CLARIFY CRITERIA FOR 5B BECAUSE IT ONLY CAPTURES ARE AT  
10 MOST 11 PERCENT OF THE REGION'S POPULATION AND I THINK WE CAN  
11 ALL RECOGNIZE THAT MORE THAN JUST 11 PERCENT OF OUR REGION'S  
12 POPULATION ARE IMPACTED BY REGIONAL SEGREGATION AND BARRIERS  
13 TO OPPORTUNITY. SO I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT FOR STAFF TO  
14 CONTINUE WORKING WITH HMC MEMBERS WHO HAVE PROPOSED  
15 ALTERNATIVES SPECIFICALLY THAT COMPOSITE SCORE ONE THAT  
16 BECAUSE THAT WOULD BE MORE ACCURATELY CAPTURING A LARGER SHARE  
17 OF THE REGION'S POPULATION WHO ARE ACTUALLY EXPERIENCING THE  
18 HARMFUL IMPACTS OF SEGREGATION AND THAT, YOU KNOW, ARE VERY  
19 MUCH THE TARGETS OF AN AFFH CRITERIA AND A RHNA THAT WILL MORE  
20 EFFECTIVELY COMBAT RACIAL SEGREGATION. THANK YOU.

21

22 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS JORDAN  
23 GRIMES. GO AHEAD.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** JORDAN GRIMES PENINSULA FOR EVERYONE. I WANT TO ECHO  
2 AARON'S COMMENTS GLAD TO SEE THE FOCUS ON TOTAL QUANTITY HERE.  
3 I ALSO STRONGLY AGREED WITH JEFF LEVIN'S COMMENTS AROUND  
4 ENSURING EXCLUSIONARY STUDIES, YOU KNOW, DON'T GET OFF THE  
5 HOOK HERE, BY ASSIGNING NUMBERS IN AGGREGATE, THAT IS INDEED  
6 HOW WE HAVE OPERATED FOR THE LAST 30, 40 YEARS AND I HOPE THAT  
7 WON'T BE THE CASE MOVING FORWARD. AND THAT'S IT THANK YOU FOR  
8 YOUR TIME.

9

10 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. THERE ARE NO OTHER MEMBERS OR  
11 ATTENDEES WITH THEIR HAND RAISED.

12

13 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** GREAT THANK YOU. I JUST HAD PINT OF  
14 CLARIFICATION. WHAT I HEARD WAS THE DESIRE FOR MORE  
15 SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSION ABOUT NUMBER FIVE, AND THE EVALUATION  
16 CRITERIA. I DON'T THINK -- I DON'T KNOW IF PUT FORWARD FOR  
17 PROPOSAL IS WE'RE FINE WITH ALL BUT FIVE.

18

19 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** I THINK IT WOULD BE DISCRETIONARY TO USING THE  
20 SAME LANGUAGE FROM THE PACKET AS DRAFTED BUT SORT OF WE'LL  
21 CONTINUE WORKING ON NUMBER FIVE BETWEEN NOW AND THE NEXT  
22 MEETING. ANYONE WHO HAS SPECIFIC INCREDIBLE AMENDMENTS TO  
23 NUMBER FIVE, COULD WORK WITH STAFF, IS THEN WE COULD SORT OF  
24 FINALIZE IT IN SEPTEMBER.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I GUESS I WOULD DEFER TO JEFF OR OTHER  
2 HMC MEMBERS THAT, YOU KNOW, WE'RE INTERESTED IN TAKING A  
3 TEMPERATURE CHECK, DOES THAT KIND OF ADDRESS -- I SEE FERNANDO  
4 IS GIVING A THUMB'S UP. KIND OF YOUR INTENT THAT WE SAY WE'RE  
5 GOING TO KIND OF HAVE MORE DISCUSSION ABOUT NUMBER FIVE, BUT  
6 WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A TEMPERATURE CHECK ON ALL OF THEM?

7

8 **JEFF LEVIN:** FOR MY STANDPOINT, YEAH I WOULD LIKE TO SEE NUMBER  
9 FIVE SEPARATED FROM THE REST BECAUSE I THINK THERE IS STILL A  
10 LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT BOTH THE METRICS AND WHAT THE  
11 CONSEQUENCES OF NOT MEETING THAT METRIC ARE.

12

13 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** OKAY.

14

15 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** GREAT. SO LET'S MOVE TO A DECISION POINT ON THE  
16 PERFORMANCE METRICS, WHERE WE'RE DECIDING WHETHER THE HMC  
17 WANTS TO RECOMMEND USING THE COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION METRICS  
18 WITH THE EXCEPTION OF NUMBER FIVE TO BETTER ENSURE METHODOLOGY  
19 OPTIONS MEET THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND ADVANCE REGIONAL  
20 POLICY GOALS. SO I'LL ASK STAFF TO TURN OFF YOUR VIDEO. AND  
21 HMC MEMBERS, IF YOU HAVE VIDEO, IF YOU COULD SHOW A GREEN CARD  
22 MEANS YOU SUPPORT THIS, YELLOW MEANS YOU HAVE SOME  
23 RESERVATIONS BUT YOU'RE NOT COMPLETELY OPPOSED TO THE  
24 DECISION, RED CARD MEANS YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** AMBER I'M NOT SEEING ANY RED BUT I'M SEEING A HANDFUL  
2 OF YELLOWS.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** SAME HERE. YOU CAN HELP ME COUNT THE YELLOWS?

5

6 **SPEAKER:** YEAH.

7

8 **PAT ECKLUND:** AND AMBER, I VOTED ON CHAT. THIS IS PAT.

9

10 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** OKAY. THANKS PAT. I SEE, I THINK, NINE YELLOWS.

11

12 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** ME TOO. SO THE DECISION POINT MOVES FORWARD  
13 THAT HMC IS RECOMMENDING USING THE COMPREHENSIVE VALUING  
14 PERFORMANCE METRICS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF FIVE AND HOPEFULLY  
15 THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO HAVE STRONG FEELINGS CAN COMMUNICATE  
16 WITH STAFF IN THE INTERVENING WEEKS AND COME BACK WITH AN  
17 UPDATE TO THAT PERFORMANCE METRIC. AND IN OUR LAST 20 MINUTES  
18 WE'RE GOING TO MOVE INTO --

19

20 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I WANTED TO RAISE THAT, YOU KNOW, IN  
21 ORDER, PROBABLY TO ENSURE THAT WE CAN HAVE A MORE COMPLETE  
22 DISCUSSION, ARE PEOPLE FINE WITH GOING BEYOND 12:00 IF  
23 NECESSARY?

24

August 28, 2020

1 **PAT ECKLUND:** JESSE, THIS IS PAT ECKLUND. THERE IS A LEAGUE OF  
2 CALIFORNIA CITIES MEETING, NORTH BAY DIVISION THAT STARTED AT  
3 11:30 I TOLD THEM I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO GET THERE UNTIL NOON.  
4 I THINK FOR THOSE OF US WHO HAVE MEETINGS I DON'T -- YOU KNOW,  
5 I REALLY THINK THAT WE NEED TO DO THIS -- IT'S UNFORTUNATE  
6 THAT WE DIDN'T DO THIS EARLIER, LIKE THE SUGGESTION, BUT SOME  
7 OF US HAVE OTHER COMMITMENTS SO I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S REALLY  
8 FAIR. BUT IF THE GROUP DECIDES TO GO AHEAD, I WILL HAVE TO  
9 MISS THAT OTHER MEETING, AND THAT'S JUST THE WAY IT'S GOING TO  
10 BE. BUT I DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S REALLY FAIR.

11

12 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** OKAY WELL WHY DON'T WE JUST PROCEED AND  
13 SEE HOW MUCH WE CAN GET DONE IN THE NEXT 15 MINUTES. IF THERE  
14 IS I DESIRE TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS FURRING, WE CAN DO THAT.

15

16 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** GREAT THANK YOU CHAIR. WE'RE MOVING INTO A  
17 CONVERSATION ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY OPTIONS AND YOU GUYS HAVE  
18 TO MAKE THIS DECISION IN SEPTEMBER. SO THE MORE THAT YOU CAN  
19 REFINE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THESE OPTIONS TO HELP STAFF PREPARE  
20 YOU, IN THE BEST POSSIBLE WAY, FOR THE SEPTEMBER MEETING, IT  
21 WOULD BE GREAT. SO I'LL JUST OPEN IT UP TO COMMENTS AND  
22 THOUGHTS. CARLOS, NOW, THEN DIANE.

23

24 **CARLOS ROMERO:** THIS IS CARLOS. I JUST WANTED TO ADDRESS THE  
25 CHAIR QUICKLY ON THE PROPOSED METHOD OF PROCEEDING ON ITEM

**August 28, 2020**

1 TWO. AGAIN, I THINK I HAD MADE A PROPOSAL TO CHANGE 5B SO IS  
2 THE CHAIR SAYING THAT INDEED WE COULD APPROACH STAFF IN THE  
3 INTERIM AND THEN SEE IF SOMETHING COMES BACK -- AND TRY TO GET  
4 SOMETHING TO COME BACK AT THE AT THE NEXT MEETING. IS THAT  
5 FAIR?

6

7 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** YES.

8

9 **CARLOS ROMERO:** GREAT. THANK YOU.

10

11 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** NELL THEN DIANE.

12

13 **NELL SELANDER:** I'M GOING TO TRY TO BE AS SUCCINCT AS HUMANLY  
14 POSSIBLE. I DON'T HAVE AN ISSUE WITH THE INCLUDING IN THE  
15 ABOVE MOD CATEGORY BUT RATHER THAT WHICH FACTOR YOU USE WE END  
16 UP A COUPLE OF REALLY EXTREME OUTLIERS IN TERMS OF ASSIGNED  
17 GROWTH IN SAN MATEO COUNTY AND I WANT TO SAY THAT REALLY  
18 INTERRELATES TO THE NEXT QUESTION ABOUT ARE WE MEETING OUR  
19 OBJECTIVES BECAUSE IF YOU LOOK AT BOTH OUR LOWER INCOME QUOTE  
20 UNQUOTE EXCLUSIONARY COMMUNITIES AND OUR HIGHER INCOME QUOTE  
21 UNQUOTE EXCLUSIONARY COMMUNITIES THE HIGHER INCOME  
22 EXCLUSIONARY COMMUNITIES HAVE A VERY MODERATE INCOME GROWTH  
23 ANTICIPATED ACROSS ALL SIX OPTIONS WHEREAS LOWER INCOME  
24 EXCLUSIONARY COMMUNITIES HAVE, LIKE, YOU KNOW, 10X THE AMOUNT  
25 OF GROWTH AS THE HIGH INCOME EXCLUSIONARY COMMUNITIES, SO IT

August 28, 2020

1 JUST MAKES ME WONDER ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THE FACTORS AND THE  
2 WAY THAT THEY'RE WEIGHTED AND SORT OF THE BACK END THAT WE  
3 CAN'T SEE THROUGH THAT -- THE VISUALIZATION TOOL IS REALLY  
4 SKEWING THIS IN A WAY WE DON'T UNDERSTAND. BECAUSE SPEND ABOUT  
5 3 TO 4 HOURS PLAYING WITH A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT OPTIONS WITH  
6 WEIGHING THE FACTORS AND COULD NEVER GET AWAY FROM THESE TWO  
7 LOWER INCOME COMMUNITIES IN TERMS OF SPACE NOT HAVING 162  
8 PERCENT GROWTH. I MEAN, LITERALLY MORE THAN DOUBLING THE  
9 ENTIRE POPULATION WITHIN EIGHT YEARS SEEMS UNREALISTIC. SO IT  
10 SEEMS TO ME MAYBE WE NEED A CAP ON GROWTH OR A WAY TO TREAT  
11 THESE EXTREME OUTLIERS, WHERE I THINK IT'S REASONABLE TO SAY  
12 WE WOULDN'T ASK ANY COMMUNITY IN OUR REGION TO MORE THAN  
13 DOUBLE ITS NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD IN EIGHT YEARS IT'S JUST A LOT  
14 FOR A COMMUNITY TO BAY AREA SO I JUST WANT TO RAISE THAT AND  
15 SEE IF STAFF HAD ANY THOUGHTS ABOUT HOW THEY'RE GOING TO  
16 ADDRESS THESE VERY EXTREME OUTLIERS. >DAVE VAUTIN: THIS IS  
17 DAVE VAUTIN WITH STAFF. I THINK YOU'RE REFERRING TO BRISBANE,  
18 IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN. WHICH IS A BIT OF A UNIQUE CASE BECAUSE  
19 IT'S RELATIVE --

20

21 **NELL SELANDER:** COLMA AS WELL, IF YOU LOOK AT OUR WHOLE COUNTY  
22 EVERYONE'S EXPECTED TO GROW BETWEEN 10 AND 20 PERCENT WHICH  
23 SEEMS REALLY REASONABLE. RIGHT? I MEAN WE KNOW WE NEED HOUSING  
24 COLMA IS 60 PERCENT BRISBANE IS 162 PERCENT. IT JUST SEEMS A  
25 LITTLE BIT OUT OF WHACK FOR THE REGION AS A WHOLE AND COMPARED

August 28, 2020

1 TO THEIR SMALLER -- THEIR PEERS THAT ARE ALSO LIKE IF YOU PUT  
2 ALL THE TINY CITY IN ONE BUCKET LIKE UNDER 110,000 POPULATION  
3 THEY'RE WAY OUT OF WHACK. >DAVE VAUTIN: I WOULD SAY THAT NOT  
4 ALL SMALL JURISDICTIONS IN THE REGION SEE LARGE AMOUNTS OF  
5 GROWTH THE ONES WHERE YEAR SEEING HIGH GROWTH LEVELS TEND TO  
6 BE PLACES OF VERY SMALL SHARE OF EXISTING HOUSEHOLDS TODAY AND  
7 SOME KEY GROWTH GEOGRAPHIES IN OUR LONG RANGE PLANNING OFTEN  
8 LOCATED NEAR BART OR CALTRAIN STATIONS AND IN THE CASE OF  
9 BRISBANE THERE IS A MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNED NEAR THAT  
10 CALTRAIN STATION. SO, I GUESS I WOULD JUST SAY, YOU KNOW, WE  
11 ACKNOWLEDGE THE RHND IS A LARGE NUMBER BUT THERE IS ALSO SOME  
12 KEY LOCATIONS IN THE REGION CLOSE TO TRANSIT THAT ARE  
13 ENVISIONED FOR SOME PRETTY SIGNIFICANT GROWTH IF OUR LONG  
14 RANGE PLAN SO THAT'S WHY YOU'RE SEEING HIGH GROWTH LEVELS IN A  
15 FEW OF THESE KIND OF SMALL JURISDICTION.

16

17 **NELL SELANDER:** IS IT NOT ON CON -- I'M SORRY -- IS IT NOT  
18 CONCERNED IF THOSE HAPPEN TO BE LOWER INCOME COMPARED TO THE  
19 SOCIAL EQUITY QUESTION IN LOWER INCOME COMMUNITIES HAVE TENDED  
20 TO ACCEPT MORE TRANSIT AND THEN THEREFORE ARE BEING MADE TO  
21 ACCOMMODATE HIGHER GROWTH WHICH I UNDERSTAND, IT ALL MAKES  
22 SENSE, BUT THE SAME CAN'T BE SAID FOR OTHER COMMUNITIES ALONG  
23 CALTRAIN THAT ARE SMALL -- COMMUNITY. >DAVE VAUTIN: I WOULD  
24 SAY, LOOK, THERE IS 101 CITIES WITH A LOT OF UNIQUE  
25 CHARACTERISTICS TO THEM ACROSS THE REGION, THERE ARE ALSO, YOU

August 28, 2020

1 KNOW, HIGHER INCOME, SMALLER JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE RAISED  
2 CONCERNS ABOUT THEIR POTENTIAL RHNA ALLOCATIONS AS WELL, LIKE  
3 YOU SAW IN THE PIEDMONT LETTER TODAY SO I GUESS I WOULD  
4 UNDERSCORE THAT, YOU KNOW, THERE IS FOCUS THE GROWTH IN THE  
5 BLUEPRINT AROUND TRANSIT, AND SO SOME OF THESE PLACES WITH  
6 ROBUST TRANSIT ARE SEEING, YOU KNOW, FAIRLY HIGH GROWTH  
7 LEVELS.

8

9 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** ALL RIGHT MOVING TO DIANE, TAWNY, THEN NOAH.

10

11 **DIANE DILLON:** HI. I HOPE NO ONE HERE WILL BE SURPRISED TO HEAR  
12 THAT EVEN THOUGH WE ALREADY DID -- TOOK A CONSENSUS ON NATURAL  
13 HAZARDS AS A FACTOR, WE WOULD RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THAT  
14 BE RECONSIDERED GIVEN WHAT WE HAVE BEEN THROUGH THE LAST  
15 ALMOST TWO WEEKS, AND WHICH IS NOT FINISHED. PLACES THAT  
16 BURNED WERE THE PLACES WHERE IT IS LESS EXPENSIVE TO BUILD  
17 HOUSING, WHERE WE WOULD HAVE DESIGNATED -- AND HAVE IN THE  
18 PAST, DESIGNATED MODERATE INCOME HOUSING TO BE BUILT, AND WE  
19 LOST ALMOST 300 UNITS IN THAT AREA WHICH, IF PAST HAZARD  
20 PERFORMANCE IS AN INDICATOR, WILL NOT BE REBUILT. I DON'T KNOW  
21 HOW WE'RE GOING TO HELP THOSE FOLKS BECAUSE THEY TEND TO BE  
22 UNINSURED OR NOT SUFFICIENTLY UNINSURED TO PLAY 5 TO \$600 PER  
23 SQUARE FOOT WHICH IS THE GOING COST HERE. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE  
24 THE FINAL METHODOLOGY THAT INCLUDES THAT FACTOR. AND AS WELL  
25 AS THE FACTOR OF URBANIZED LAND AREA. ALL OF US HAVE, AS OUR

August 28, 2020

1 BEST INTEREST, TO SEE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT OCCUR WITHIN  
2 URBANIZED AREAS, YOU CAN'T BUILD WHAT YOU NEED TO BUILD  
3 BECAUSE OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS IN NON-URBANIZED AREAS. WE  
4 HAD AND HAVE CERTAIN AREAS IN THE EASTERN PART OF THE COUNTY  
5 THAT PRETTY MUCH ALL BURNED. I MEAN WE WERE ABLE -- CAL FIRE  
6 DID A FABULOUS JOB SAVING MUCH OF TWO IMMUNITIES, ONE OF WHICH  
7 IS A DUCK -- I'M SORRY -- I'M SO TIRED, I HAVE FORGOTTEN WHAT  
8 THE PHRASE MEANS -- BUT YOU ALL KNOW WHAT A DUCK IS, I HOPE.  
9 WE WOULD SUGGEST CONSIDERING AN OPTION WHERE ALL OF THE INCOME  
10 CATEGORIES USE SOMETHING THAT IS 50 PERCENT ACCESS TO HIGH  
11 OPPORTUNITY AREAS 30 PERCENT JOBS PROXIMITY TRANSIT, AND 20  
12 PERCENT JOBS. THIS WOULD ADDRESS HOUSING AND HOUSING CLOSE TO  
13 TRANSIT AND ACCESS TO JOBS FOR ALL HOUSEHOLDS NOT WITH  
14 STANDING WHAT WE'RE GOING THROUGH, STAFF SPENT A LOT OF TIME  
15 YESTERDAY ON THIS. SO WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT OF THIS  
16 COMMITTEE. THANK YOU.

17

18 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS DIANE. SO JUST A REMINDER THAT WE END AT  
19 1205, AND WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT AT THE END OF THIS, SO IF YOU  
20 COULD KEEP YOUR REMARKS QUICK, TAWNY, NO A VICTORIA.

21

22 **SPEAKER:** THANKS AMBER. AS I MENTIONED AT OUR LAST MEETING HCD  
23 WILL BE REVIEWING TO SEE IF THE METHODOLOGY MEETS THE FIVE  
24 STATUTORY OBJECTIVES OF RHNA. IF THIS COMMITTEE STICKS WITH  
25 THE RECOMMENDATION OF USING THE 2050 HOUSEHOLDS VERSUS 2019

August 28, 2020

1 HOUSEHOLDS, OR THE PROPORTIONAL GROWTH FROM PLANNED BAY AREA,  
2 WE WOULD STRONGLY EMPHASIZE THE NEED OF CONSIDERABLY AWAITING  
3 ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITY AND FACTORS OF JOBS/HOUSING FIT THAT  
4 SHIFTS THE BASELINE TO COUNTERACT SOME OF THE CONCERNS OF, YOU  
5 KNOW, TO THE EXTENT IF THERE IS ANY CAPPING IN THE BAY AREA  
6 BASED ON EXISTING ZONING, OR SHIFTING AWAY FROM COMMUNITIES  
7 THAT HAVE NOT INVESTED IN PUBLIC TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE OR ANY  
8 FACTORS SUCH AS THE SPEED OF BY WHICH THE JURISDICTION APPROVE  
9 HOUSING PERMITS OR JURISDICTION'S CURRENT ZONED CAPACITY WHICH  
10 ARGUABLY SHOULDN'T BE IN THE RHNA ALLOCATION BASED ON  
11 STATUTORY GUIDELINES. AND AS RHNA ALLOCATING RHNA BASED ON  
12 LAND USE PROJECTIONS, THOSE CAN RESULT IN THE ALLOCATION NOT  
13 FURTHERING THE FIVE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND THAT BEING PART  
14 OF THE DISCUSSION AROUND THE CRITERIA THAT WE'RE -- THAT THIS  
15 GROUP IS LOOKING AT. BUT JUST BY WEIGHTING ACCESS OPPORTUNITY  
16 AND FACTORS JOBS/HOUSING FIT TO COUNTER BALANCE EFFECTS WILL  
17 BE IMPORTANT SO THE END RESULT IS EQUITABLE ALLOCATION. I JUST  
18 WANTED TO NOTE, FROM THE ALLOCATION RESULTS TABLE THAT STAFF  
19 SENT OUT IN THE EXCEL SHEET AFTER THE LAST MEETING THAT THE  
20 2050 HOUSEHOLDS SHOW THOSE CONSISTENTLY LOWER ALLOCATIONS FOR  
21 VERY LOW INCOME AND LOW INCOME FOR MANY JURISDICTION, AND THAT  
22 FACTOR IS TO COMPENSATE FOR THOSE JURISDICTION WHICH ARE HIGH  
23 OPPORTUNITY AREAS AND JUST TO NOTE TO THE EXTENT THAT PLANNED  
24 BAY AREA IS DIRECTING GROWTH TOWARD TRANSIT, IT MIGHT NOT MAKE  
25 SENSE TO GIVE THIS A HIGHER -- OR ANOTHER CONSIDERATION AS A

August 28, 2020

1 FACTOR IF EXCLUSIONARY JURISDICTION HAVEN'T INVESTED IN  
2 TRANSIT. SO JUST WANTED TO SHARE THOSE THOUGHTS.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS. NOAH, VICTORIA THEN SCOTT.

5

6 **SPEAKER:** THE CHOICE TO USE THE 2050 BASELINE DATA IS CREATING  
7 SOME SKEWED STARTING POINTS WE'RE THEN TRYING TO WORK  
8 BACKWARDS WITH THE DIFFERENT METHODOLOGIES AND I THINK WE NEED  
9 SIDE BOARDS ON THE PROCESS TO ADDRESS SOME OF THESE MAJOR  
10 OUTLIERS WHETHER IT'S TO DO WITH INCOME LEVELS OR WHETHER TO  
11 DO WITH FOLKS WHO ARE SEEING US AS SHOULD BE GROWING OR ARE  
12 MAYBE NOT GETTING AN ALLOCATION AS WE CHOOSE THESE AND I KNOW  
13 THAT'S KIND OF SELECTIVE. SO IT WOULD BE CHALLENGING TO DO.  
14 JUST ONE EXAMPLE THAT I LOOKED AT, IT DIDN'T APPLY IN THE  
15 CITIES SEBASTOPOL MORE GROWTH THAN THEIR GENERAL PLAN BUILD-  
16 OUT CAPACITY BECAUSE OF INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITATIONS THEY DON'T  
17 HAVE THE SEWER CAPACITY TO BE ABLE TO GROW WITH THE ALLOCATION  
18 THAT'S BEING GIVEN TO THEM. SO THERE ARE SOME FACTORS THAT  
19 JUST LITERALLY WE'RE SETTING FOLKS UP TO FAIL, AND SIMILARLY  
20 WITH OUR NATURAL HAZARD ISSUES, THAT DIANE POINTED OUT BY  
21 PUSHING FOLKS TO PUT UNITS IN LOCATIONS THAT LITERALLY HAVE NO  
22 PLACE BEING THERE GIVEN THE REALITY OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE  
23 PLACES THAT WE'RE GOING SO IF WE COULD AT LEAST BE THOUGHTFUL  
24 ABOUT THOSE IMPACTS AND TRY TO COME UP WITH A WAY TO SHAVE OFF  
25 THE OUTLIERS ON ALL SIDES, I DO THINK THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL,

August 28, 2020

1 AND I KNOW IT'S NOT GOING TO BE EASY BUT I THINK PEOPLE SHOWER  
2 CONSCIOUS -- SHOULD BE CONSCIOUS OF THAT.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** VICTORIA.

5

6 **VICTORIA FIERCE:** I WANT TO PUSH BACK ON THE IDEA THAT WE HAVE  
7 TO ADDRESS THESE EXTREME OUTLIERS BECAUSE WE'RE ALREADY  
8 STARTING FROM A POINT OF HAVING EXTREME OUTLIERS IN THE WAY  
9 OUR CITIES HAVE BEEN BUILT IN THE LAST 40 YEARS. THERE ARE  
10 SOME CITIES THAT ARE VERY DIVERSE RACIALLY ECONOMICALLY AND SO  
11 ON AND THERE ARE OTHER CITIES THAT ARE THEMSELVES OUTLIERS  
12 THEY HAVE 80 PERIODS WHITE POPULATION OR HIGHER RELATIVELY  
13 CITY SIGNIFICANT NATION LIKE ATHERTON. THESE OUTLIERS ARE MORE  
14 ADDRESSING THE FACT THAT WE ALREADY HAVE OUTLIERS IF A CITY  
15 HAS DONE REMARKABLY POOR THEY WILL CONTINUE TO DO POOR. I AM  
16 FIGURING NUMBERS IN THE PENINSULA. WE'RE BEING ASPIRATIONAL.  
17 YOU'RE FINDING A WAY TO MEET THESE NUMBERS WE OWE A  
18 RESPONSIBILITY TO OUR COMMUNITY. AND COPPING OUT IS NOT  
19 HELPFUL AT ALL AND WE TALKED ABOUT THAT WHEN WE STARTED THIS  
20 BACK IN DECEMBER, IS THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO BE BACKING DOWN  
21 FROM CITIES OPPOSING THIS STUFF.

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** SCOTT THEN AARTI.

24

**August 28, 2020**

1 **SPEAKER:** THANKS. I WOULD ALSO BE CONCERNED ABOUT OUTLIERS.  
2 CITIES APPROPRIATELY ZONED AS A RESULT OF OUR ALLOCATIONS,  
3 WOULD PERHAPS FAIL TO MEET THAT ZONING IT OPENS UP  
4 OPPORTUNITIES CREATED THROUGH LEGISLATION SUCH AS SENATE BILL  
5 35 PASSED IN 2017 TO STREAMLINE APPROVALS AND SEE IF SOMETHING  
6 FEASIBLY CAN BE WORKED OUT THAT WOULD TAKE CARE OF BOTH  
7 HOUSING NEEDS AND SOMETHING THAT'S NEAR AND DEAR TO ME AS A  
8 REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CARPENTER'S UNION WHICH IS REINFORCING A  
9 DIFFERENT PATTERN OF BUILDING A CONSTRUCTION WORKFORCE THAT IS  
10 NOT A LOW WAGE, LOW PRODUCTIVITY STRATEGY WHICH HAS GOTTEN TO  
11 THE LABOR SHORTAGES THAT WE HAVE, WHICH IS IN ITSELF  
12 RECOGNIZED AS A BARRIER TO ACTUALLY INCREASING OUR HOUSING  
13 SUPPLY BUT RATHER TURN TO A HIGHER PRODUCTIVITY, HIGH WAGE  
14 OUTCOME THAT WILL INCREASE OUR CAPACITY TO BUILD, AS WELL AS  
15 REDUCE THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES IN OUR AREA THAT ARE VERY LOW  
16 INCOME. SO WITH THAT, I AM GOING TO BE INTERESTED IN SEEING  
17 WHERE THIS GOES WITH A FAVOR OF A MODIFIED 3B. I'LL NOTE THAT  
18 IT'S IN THE CHAT, I PROPOSE THAT WE TAKE A LOOK AT THE ABOVE  
19 MODERATE GROUPS AND UNDER 3B CONSTRUCT TO LOOK INSTEAD OF A  
20 JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE, LOOK AT JOBS PROXIMITY WITH PARTICULAR  
21 FOCUS ON AUTO PROXIMITY. THANK YOU.

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** CHAIR ARREGUIN, WE HAVE FOUR PEOPLE WITH THEIR  
24 HANDS RAISED. BUT ONLY TWO MINUTES LEFT TO GO. I BELIEVE THERE  
25 IS PUBLIC COMMENT.

August 28, 2020

1

2 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I THINK AT THIS POINT SINCE WE'RE NOT  
3 MAKING A DECISION GIVEN THE TIME, I THINK MY RECOMMENDATION  
4 WOULD BE THAT WE GO TO 12:15 AND PROVIDE COMMENTS THAT STAFF  
5 CAN USE TO SORT OF BRING BACK FURTHER THOUGHTS OR  
6 RECOMMENDATIONS AT OUR NEXT MEETING. SO, I THINK WHATEVER  
7 FEEDBACK CAN BE PROVIDED, OVER THE NEXT 15. SWOULD BE HELPFUL,  
8 AND WE DO NEED TO TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT AS WELL.

9

10 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** FABULOUS. SO IF FOLKS DO NEED TO HOP OFF IF TWO  
11 MINUTES, IF YOU WANT TO PUT YOUR THOUGHTS IN CHAT, WHAT YOU  
12 WOULD LIKE TO SEE, IDEALLY, GIVEN STAFF TIME, WHAT YOU WOULD  
13 LIKE TO SEE AHEAD OF THE SEPTEMBER MEETING. AND IF YOU CAN'T  
14 DO IT IN THE NEXT FEW MINUTES FEEL FREE TO LEAVE AND IF YOU  
15 CAN STAY WE'LL CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION IN THE NEXT FEW  
16 MINUTES. AARTI.

17

18 **AARTI SHRIVASTAVA:** HI. I WOULD LIKE TO REITERATE THE  
19 IMPORTANCE OF THE THREE FACTORS THAT WE HAVE BEEN TALKING  
20 ABOUT, WHICH IS INCREASING, YOU KNOW, THE HOUSING SUPPLY, AND  
21 THE MIX OF HOUSING, AND MAKING SURE THAT THE LOW INCOME  
22 ALLOCATIONS ARE PROPERLY DISTRIBUTED. IN COMMUNITIES THAT  
23 HAVEN'T DONE IT HISTORICALLY. JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE, AND,  
24 AGAIN, FOCUSING GROWTH IN THE URBAN CORE NEAR TRANSIT. SO I  
25 WILL BE LOOKING FOR THE THREE FACTOR APPROACH, OR BRINGING

August 28, 2020

1 TRANSIT INTO THE EQUATION. DON'T BELIEVE REMOVING TRANSIT IS A  
2 RESPONSIBLE WAY OF ALLOCATING UNITS. RUBY.

3

4 **SPEAKER:** I HAVE A QUICK CLARIFICATION QUESTION. I THOUGHT THAT  
5 THE 2050 BLUEPRINT BAY AREA PLAN WAS OUR BASELINE BUT THEN I  
6 HEARD SOME PEOPLE SAYING IF WE CHOOSE TO USE 2050 OR 2019, IS  
7 THAT STILL ON THE TABLE? OR AM I --

8

9 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I THINK 2050 HOUSEHOLDS IS OUR  
10 BASELINE. WE DECIDE THAT AT THE LAST MEETING.

11

12 **SPEAKER:** GREAT. I JUST WANTED TO CONFIRM THAT WAS DONE IS AND  
13 WE'RE NOT REVISITING THAT. AND JUST THE OTHER QUESTION THEY  
14 HAD ON THIS, WHICH, THE COMMENTS AROUND THESE OUTLIERS AND THE  
15 UNINCORPORATED AREAS, I JUST WANT TO GET CLARIFICATION AND  
16 IT'S PROBABLY SOMEWHERE IN THE PACKET, SO I APOLOGIZE FOR THE  
17 REPETITION HERE, IT DOESN'T SEEM LIKE, FOR ME, THAT THESE  
18 SCENARIOS DRAMATICALLY BUILD IN UNINCORPORATED AREAS. IS THAT  
19 -- AM I UNDERSTANDING, I'M NOT UNDERSTANDING CORRECTLY IN  
20 TERMS OF THE PROBLEMS THAT OTHER HMC MEMBERS ARE BRINGING UP  
21 HERE?

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** WOULD YOU LIKE TO SHARE THOUGHTS.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **NELL SELANDER:** I THINK MY POINT HAS BEEN MISCONSTRUED ABOUT  
2 OUTLIERS, AND I WANT TO DRAW A VERY SPECIFIC PARALLEL BECAUSE  
3 WE HAVE TWO COMMUNITY IN SAN MATEO COUNTY THAT I THINK  
4 EXEMPLIFY WHAT'S GOING ON IN SMALL COMMUNITIES. YOU KNOW, SAN  
5 MATEO COUNTY IS SUPER DIVERSE IN TERMS OF THE TYPE OF CITIES  
6 AND WHAT THEY'RE LIKE IF YOU LOOK AT ATHERTON AND COLMA BOTH  
7 ARE ON FIXED RAIL, THEY BOTH TOUCH EL CAMINO THEY BOTH HAVE  
8 SMALL LAND AREAS LESS THAN FIVE SQUARE MILES AND THEY BOTH  
9 HAVE FEWER THAN 2500 RESIDENTS. ONE IS EXPECTED -- AND BOTH  
10 HAVE MET THEIR RHNA.

11

12 **SPEAKER:** BUT I WANT TO PUT BOTH OF THOSE -- INCORPORATED --

13

14 **NELL SELANDER:** WHAT IS EXPECTED TO GROW BUT WHAT'S SKEWING  
15 THESE NUMBERS LOWER INCOME SMALL COMMUNITIES IN ORDER TO PAY  
16 FOR SERVICES GROW THEIR RETAIL AND OFFICE LAND USES SO THAT  
17 THEY CAN AFFORD TO PROVIDE PARKS AND ALL OF THESE NICE THINGS  
18 THAT JUST HIGHER PROPERTY BASIS CAN GET -- CAN AFFORD ALREADY  
19 SO IN THE BLUEPRINT FOR 2050 HOUSEHOLDS I THINK THOSE  
20 COMMUNITIES ARE SORT OF -- THEY'RE JUST A LITTLE -- IF I TAKE  
21 COMMUNITIES THAT ON PAPER LOOK THE SAME, BUT THEN YOU ADD IN  
22 SORT OF INCOME I THINK AT LEAST WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH THE  
23 OUTLIERS IN SAN MATEO COUNTY IS THE OUTLIERS HAPPEN TO BE NO  
24 INCOME.

25

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** I THINK THAT'S A DIFFERENT ISSUE. I'M MORE THINKING  
2 ABOUT UNINCORPORATED AREAS THAT FOLKS ARE TALKING ABOUT, A  
3 FEAR OF SPRAWL. I DON'T REALLY FEAR SPRAWL IN THE PENINSULA I  
4 DON'T FEAR SPRAWL IN THE PENINSULA. WE SHOULD BE BUILDING MORE  
5 EXPONENTIALLY THERE. I AM WORRIED ABOUT IN AREAS WHERE PEOPLE  
6 HAVE OVER CONCERN PRODUCTION AND SPRAWL, WHERE ARE YOU SEEING  
7 THAT, I GUESS, IN SOME OF THESE SCENARIOS. I AM MORE INCLINED  
8 TO 3B SO I'M LOOKING AT THE THAT ONE IN PARTICULAR. AND I'M  
9 NOT SURE IF I'M MISSING THE ISSUE OF SPRAWL IN UNINCORPORATED  
10 AREAS WHERE YOU DON'T HAVE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT THAT  
11 GROWTH.

12

13 **SPEAKER:** RUBY, I CAN CHIME IN FOR SOLANO COUNTY. IF YOU LOOK  
14 AT UNINCORPORATED SOLANO COUNTY IN ALL OF THESE AREAS YOU'RE  
15 LOOKING AT PERCENTAGE OF GROWTH OF BETWEEN 20 AND 23 PERCENT.  
16 AND IT'S DOUBLE, TRIPLE TIMES THE AMOUNT OF CITY IN SOLANO  
17 COUNTY WE DON'T HAVE CITY SEWER OR WATER EVERYTHING'S ON  
18 SEPTIC AND WELL. THAT'S CERTAINLY AN OUTLIER ONE WOULD THINK  
19 THAT ADVANCES POOR PLANNING PRACTICES. THAT ADVANCES  
20 COMMUTERS, SMALL, AND THAT ADVANCES INCREASES IN GREENHOUSE  
21 GAS. SO, I THINK, FROM A RURAL COMMUNITY, FROM AN AGRICULTURAL  
22 COMMUNITY, I THINK THAT'S THE CONCERN WHEN WE REFER TO  
23 OUTLIERS.

24

25 **SPEAKER:** GREAT. THANK YOU.

August 28, 2020

1

2 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** WONDERFUL. THANKS ALL. ELLEN THEN MICHAEL.

3

4 **ELLEN CLARK:** THANK YOU. JUST A COUPLE OF POINTS. I AGREE WITH  
5 THE COMMENTS REGARDING TRANSIT. SOMEONE ASKED THE QUESTION IN  
6 THE CHAT WHETHER OR NOT PLANNED BAY AREA REFLECTS TRANSIT, AND  
7 IT DOES, BUT I THINK MANY OF THE FACTORS AND METHODOLOGIES  
8 THAT ARE PROPOSED ARE TENDING TO SKEW THINGS AWAY FROM SOME OF  
9 THOSE MORE TRANSIT-RICH AREAS. AND SO, I THINK IT WOULD BE  
10 WORTHWHILE, PUTTING BACK IN A TRANSIT FACTOR TO TURN THE DIAL  
11 BACK IN A WAY THEY THINK HELPS TO REACH OUR REGIONAL GOALS, AS  
12 FAR AS GREENHOUSE GASSES AND COMMUTE PATTERNS THAT ARE  
13 REGIONALLY IMPORTANT. I TOOK EXCEPTION A LITTLE BIT TO THE  
14 COMMENT ABOUT COMMUNITIES NOT SUPPORTING TRANSIT. MOST TRANSIT  
15 DOLLARS ARE ALLOCATED BY COUNTIES. THOSE TRANSIT DOLLARS TEND  
16 TO GO TO CERTAIN COMMUNITIES THE WAY THAT THOSE PROCESSES ARE  
17 SET UP, AND DON'T FAVOR SOME OF THE MORE SUBURBAN AREAS. SO  
18 IT'S NOT NECESSARILY A LOCAL DECISION THAT'S DRIVING  
19 ALLOCATION OF TRANSIT DOLLARS MORE THAN COUNTY-WIDE DECISIONS.  
20 SO THOSE REALLY MORE COMMENTS. AS FAR AS THE OUTLIERS GO IT'S  
21 A REALITY CHECK. I THINK ABOUT COMMUNITIES LIKE ATHERTON AND  
22 PIEDMONT THEY ARE WEALTHY COMMUNITIES, THEY ARE SMALL, THEY  
23 ARE GEOGRAPHICALLY CONSTRAINED AND IT'S NOT REALISTIC TO  
24 EXPECT A COMMUNITY TO GROW BY MANY DEGREES MORE THAN THEIR  
25 REGIONAL GROWTH EXPECTATIONS. I DON'T THINK PIEDMONT IS SAYING

August 28, 2020

1 THEY DON'T WANT ANY GROWTH THEY'RE JUST SAYING HEY, GIVE US AN  
2 ALLOCATION THAT IS REALISTIC. THOSE ARE MY COMMENTS.

3

4 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANK YOU. MICHAEL THEN PAT.

5

6 **MICHAEL BRILLIOT:** I'M HEARING CONCERN ABOUT GROWTH BEING  
7 ALLOCATED IN PARTICULAR COUNTIES PARTICULARLY RURAL AND AG.  
8 SAN MATEO IS NOT CONCERNED ABOUT THAT AS MUCH IN PREVIOUS  
9 MEETINGS THEY HAVE INFILL AREAS THAT ARE UNINCORPORATED I WANT  
10 TO ADDRESS THE NEXT MEETING AND TALK ABOUT WHY BLUEPRINT DOES  
11 THAT OR IS OR IS NOT FURTHERING OUR STRATEGY IN BLUEPRINT. I  
12 SEE SANTA CLARA COUNTY WILL GET BETWEEN ROUGHLY 404,700 UNITS,  
13 AND A LITTLE CONCERNED ABOUT THAT ON THE SURFACE IT MAY BE  
14 OKAY IF THERE IS EXPLANATION. SAN JOSE HAS BEEN WORKING WITH  
15 THE COUNTY TO FOCUS GROWTH INFILL WE HAVE URBAN GROWTH  
16 BOUNDARIES COUNTY FOCUSED ON INCORPORATION OF AREAS FOR AG  
17 WE'RE OPEN SPACE. I WANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT BETTER AT THE NEXT  
18 MEETING. THANK YOU.

19

20 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS MICHAEL. NEYSA THEN PAT. NEYSA, ARE YOU  
21 ON THE CALL?

22

23 **NEYSA FLIGOR:** OH SORRY. I THOUGHT YOU SAID MICHAEL. THANKS  
24 AMBER. I HAVE TO DROP IN TWO MINUTES SO I'LL BE QUICK. I  
25 SUPPORT OPTION 1A I BELIEVABILITY WE SHOULD HAVE METHODOLOGY

August 28, 2020

1 THAT INCLUDES THOSE THREE FACTORS, AND AS A COUPLE OF SPEAKERS  
2 HAVE ALREADY SAID TRANSIT IS VERY IMPORTANT PROXIMITY TO  
3 TRANSIT IS VERY IMPORTANT IT TIES IN DIRECTLY WITH A LOT OF  
4 THE GOALS THIS PROCESS. SO I SUPPORT LOOKING AT THE DIFFERENT  
5 OPTIONS IN OUR PACKET. OPTION 1A. THANK YOU. AND I ALSO  
6 SUPPORT, IF NECESSARY, HAVING A SECOND MEETING IN SEPTEMBER.  
7 BECAUSE I WOULDN'T LIKE TO SEE US RUSH THIS DISCUSSION, AND  
8 THEN HAVE A MEETING ON THE 18th TO VOTE. SO THAT'S MY  
9 RECOMMENDATION, IF IT'S POSSIBLE TO HAVE A SECOND MEETING.  
10 THANK YOU.

11

12 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS NIECE A PAT.

13

14 **PAT ECKLUND:** AMBER, IS IT ME?

15

16 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** IT'S YOU.

17

18 **PAT ECKLUND:** OKAY. I ACTUALLY AGREE WITH THE LAST COMMENTER,  
19 THAT I THINK THIS DECISION -- THIS DISCUSSION IS REALLY  
20 PERSONALITY, AND IF WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH TIME ON THE 16th, OR  
21 WHENEVER THE NEXT MEETING IS, THEN I THINK A SPECIAL MEETING  
22 TO TALK ABOUT IT WOULD BE HELPFUL. BUT, I DO NOT SUPPORT --  
23 WELL, I DO SUPPORT OPTION ONE. AND I DO BELIEVE, BECAUSE I  
24 BELIEVE THAT HOUSING SHOULD BE PUT WHERE JOBS ARE, BUT I ALSO  
25 BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE SOME FACTOR OF HIGH RESOURCE

August 28, 2020

1 AREAS, AND I AGREE WITH DIANE, THAT THE URBANIZED AREA NEEDS  
2 TO BE LOOKED AT, BECAUSE, WELL, WHAT I CALL THE BUILDABLE  
3 AREA, BECAUSE, YOU CAN'T PUT -- WELL YOU -- YOU KNOW, YOU  
4 SHOULDN'T PUT HOUSING WHERE YOU CAN'T BUILD. I KNOW THAT THERE  
5 HAS BEEN SOME DISCUSSION, WELL, YOU CAN PUT -- YOU CAN BUILD  
6 ANYWHERE, BUT YOU REALLY SHOULD NOT BE BUILDING ON AG-LAND FOR  
7 AN EXAMPLE, BECAUSE WE NEED AG-LAND TO BE PRODUCTIVE SO THAT  
8 WE CAN REMAIN AS A SPECIES. AND YOU NEED OPEN SPACE. YOU NEED  
9 YOUR HEALTH, AND YOU NEED THAT QUALITY OF LIFE. SO I THINK  
10 THAT OPTION B GOES WAY TOO FAR -- NOT B -- THREE GOES WAY TOO  
11 FAR, IT DOESN'T FACTOR IN THE JOBS AT ALL. AND I DON'T THINK  
12 THAT A 50 PERCENT WITH HIGH RESOURCE AREAS MAKES SENSE,  
13 WITHOUT REALLY FACTORING IN THE URBANIZED AREA, WHERE IS THE  
14 BUILDABLE AREA. SO I -- AND JOBS OF COURSE HAS TO BE A FACTOR.  
15 SO, I THINK THAT WE MAY WANT TO LOOK AT ANOTHER OPTION. AND  
16 HAVE A SPECIAL MEETING IN SEPTEMBER TO TALK ABOUT IT.

17

18 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS PAT. RICK AND THEN ELISE.

19

20 **RICK BONILLA:** RICK BONILLA.

21

22 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** YES. GO FOR IT.

23

24 **RICK BONILLA:** I WOULD LIKE TO SAY I'M VERY INTERESTED IN WHAT  
25 WAS SPOKEN OF EARLIER WHERE WE SPEAK ABOUT 3B MODIFIED TO SHOW

August 28, 2020

1 50 PERCENT HIGH OPPORTUNITY, PLUS 50 PERCENT JOB  
2 PROXIMITY/AUTO WHICH DOES TAKE INTO ACCOUNT JOBS AND I THINK  
3 WE WOULD DO VERY WELL WITH 3A, THOSE ARE MY THOUGHTS ON THAT.  
4 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

5

6 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS RICK. ELISE THEN FERNANDO AND THEN JEFF.

7

8 **SPEAKER:** I SUPPORT INCLUDING A JOBS FACTOR IN ORDER TO FURTHER  
9 OUR STATUTORY OBJECTIVE TO PROMOTE AN IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP  
10 BETWEEN JOBS AND HOUSING, AND ALSO TO FURTHER OUR  
11 ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS, AND I THINK THE RESULTING NUMBERS STILL  
12 ALLOCATE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF UNITS OR HOUSEHOLDS TO HIGH  
13 RESOURCE AREAS PROBABLY MORE THAN THEY HAVE BUILT IN THE LAST  
14 50 YEARS SO I'M NOT WORRIED ABOUT HAVING TO INCREASE THE  
15 NUMBERS HIGHER FOR THOSE HIGH RESOURCE AREAS, BUT I REALLY  
16 THINK THAT WE NEED TO ADD JOBS AS A FACTOR INTO THE  
17 METHODOLOGY.

18

19 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS ELISE. FERNANDO THEN JEFF.

20

21 **FERNANDO MARTI:** WAS THAT FOR ME?

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** IF YOU.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **FERNANDO MARTI:** SORRY. I JUST SAW SOMETHING GOING ON OUTSIDE.  
2 I WANT TO REITERATE, WE'RE -- GIVE MY SUPPORT TO SOME OF THE  
3 POINTS THAT WERE MADE ABOUT JOBS PROXIMITY AND BEING ABLE TO  
4 HAVE BOTH AUTO PROXIMITY AND TRANSIT PROXIMITY AS FACTORS, I  
5 THINK, TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE BAY AREA REALLY WORKS. IF WE ONLY  
6 FOCUS ON TRANSIT PROXIMITY, WE LEAVE A LOT OF AREAS WHERE YOU,  
7 PEOPLE DRIVE TO WORK, AND SO THOSE TWO FACTORS ARE REALLY  
8 IMPORTANT. THEY REALLY WANT TO EMPHASIZE, I THINK, THE BIGGEST  
9 FACTOR BEING THE HIGH OPPORTUNITY PIECE.

10

11 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS. WE HAVE TWO PEOPLE WITH HANDS RAISED,  
12 AND THEN I THINK WE'LL CLOSE OUR CONVERSATION. JEFF THEN  
13 CARLOS KEEP IT AS QUICK AS YOU CAN. THANK YOU.

14

15 **JEFF LEVIN:** THANK YOU. QUICKLY, FIRST, I SUPPORT THE SECOND  
16 MEETING. WE'RE DOWN TO THE MOST CRITICAL ISSUES AND I WOULD  
17 HAT TO SEE US CRUNCHED HERE WHEN WE SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME  
18 AT THE START OF THE PROCESS TALKING BROAD CONCEPT, AND IF  
19 THERE IS A WAY TO DO THAT, WE SHOULD. I DO THINK TRANSIT  
20 FACTORS ARE ALREADY INCORPORATED IN THE 2050 HOUSEHOLDS  
21 PROJECTIONS. IT'S NOT LIKE WE AREN'T CONSIDERING TRANSIT. BUT  
22 I DO LIKE SCOTT'S IDEA OF SUBSTITUTING JOBS PROXIMITY FOR  
23 JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE OR FIT. PROBLEM WITH JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE  
24 OR FIT IS THEY'RE SPECIFIC TO A JURISDICTION WE COULD PUT  
25 HOUSING IN THE JURISDICTION NEXT DOOR TO JOBS JUST AS WE COULD

**August 28, 2020**

1 PUT IT IN THE JURISDICTION THAT HAS JOBS AND IF THE  
2 JURISDICTION NEXT DOOR IS MORE EXCLUSIONARY I WANT IT TO TAKE  
3 ITS FAIR SHARE. AND JUST REMIND PEA THAT JOB PROXIMITY BY AUTO  
4 CAN ALSO BE A GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCING STRATEGY IF WHAT WE DO  
5 IS HAVE PEOPLE DRIVING FIVE MILES TO WORK INSTEAD OF 50 MILES  
6 TO WORK, WE HAVE REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, TRANSIT IS  
7 NOT THE ONLY WAY THAT WE DO IT. IT IS ONE OF THE WAYS THAT WE  
8 DO THAT. AND THEN LASTLY, JUST A CLARIFICATION QUESTION ABOUT  
9 WHAT IT MEANS FOR US TO VOTE A PREDOMINANCE OF YELLOW CARDS  
10 DOES THAT BLOCK A DECISION OR REQUIRE US TO COME BACK AND  
11 RECONSIDER IT BECAUSE IT SOUND LIKE THERE IS STILL A LOT OF  
12 BACK AND FORTH ON A VERSUS B, I PERSONNEL REALLY LIKE 3B AS A  
13 METHODOLOGY BUT IF WE HAVE RULED OUT GROUPING MODERATE INCOME  
14 WITH VERY LOW AND LOW THEN ALL THE B OPTIONS ARE OFF THE  
15 TABLE. I'M UNCLEAR WHAT THE YELLOW VOTES REALLY MEAN

16

17 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** IT JUST MEANS YOU DIDN'T COME TO A CONSENSUS  
18 THAT DECISION POINT AND THAT YOU CAN KEEP HAVING CONVERSATION  
19 ABOUT IT ONLY CHALLENGE IS THERE IS NOT A LOT OF TIME.

20

21 **JEFF LEVIN:** RIGHT BUT IT'S NOT OFF THE TABLE.

22

23 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** EXACTLY. CARLOS YOU'RE UP.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **CARLOS ROMERO:** MODIFIED 3B WITH PROXIMITY JOBS TO AUTO IS THE  
2 RIGHT CHOICE IT'S THE VMT VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED THAT ALSO GET  
3 REDUCED SO I WOULD SUPPORT MODIFYING THE THREE. AND I THINK A  
4 NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE, RICK AND JEFF SAID. THANKS.

5

6 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANKS CARLOS. WE'RE GOING TO END THE  
7 CONVERSATION OF HMC MEMBERS THERE, IF YOU HAVE SUGGESTIONS FOR  
8 THE METHODOLOGIES IF YOU COULD E-MAIL THEM IN WRITING, IT  
9 WOULD BE REALLY HELPFUL FOR STAFF. WE'RE GOING TO CAPTURE  
10 EVERYTHING THAT PEOPLE ARE PUTTING INTO CHAT AND THE  
11 CONVERSATION TODAY, BUT IF YOU DIDN'T GET TO SAY ENOUGH,  
12 PLEASE SEND IT IN WRITING. AND I'LL TURN IT BACK TO YOU, CHAIR  
13 ARREGUIN.

14

15 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** LET'S NOW GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT WE HAVE  
16 TWO RAISED HANDS 672 MINUTES EACH.

17

18 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** YES.

19

20 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** FIRST SPEAKER IS AARON ECKHOUSE. GO AHEAD.

21

22 **SPEAKER:** AARON ECKHOUSE CALIFORNIA YIMBY. I SUPPORT THE  
23 COMMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE ABOUT METHODOLOGIES FOCUSED ON A  
24 COMBINATION OF ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITY. AND JOBS PROXIMITY. I  
25 AGREE THAT JOBS PROXIMITY IS THE BEST FACTOR TO USE FOR JOBS

August 28, 2020

1 FIRST OF ALL BECAUSE IT BETTER CAPTURES WHAT PEOPLE WANT FROM  
2 HOUSING WHICH IS A SHORT COMMUTE RATHER THAN BEING IN  
3 NECESSARILY THE SAME JURISDICTION AS THEIR JOB. THEY JUST WANT  
4 TO BE CLOSE. I ALSO THINK JOBS PROXIMITY IS GOING TO BE A  
5 BETTER JOB OF ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS THAT A NUMBER OF PEOPLE  
6 HAVE RAISED ABOUT SMALL INTO UNINCORPORATED AREAS. I THINK  
7 IT'S GOING TO DO -- JOBS PROXIMITY WILL DO A BETTER JOB OF  
8 LIMITING THAT THAN THE NATURAL HAZARD FACTOR. NATURAL HAZARD  
9 FACTOR, CURRENTLY PROPOSED DIRECTS MORE GROWTH TO  
10 UNINCORPORATED AND SOLANO COUNTIES THAN IT DOES TO PALO ALTO  
11 OR BERKELEY WHICH INDICATES IT'S NOT GOING TO ACHIEVE FOR THE  
12 PEOPLE WHO WOULD HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT FIRE HAZARD WANT IT  
13 TO ACHIEVE. I THINK JOBS PROXIMITY WILL DO A BETTER JOB OF  
14 THAT SO I ENCOURAGE YOU TO USE THAT AS FACTOR. TO PROVIDE  
15 MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS WITH ACCESS TO AN EDUCATIONALLY  
16 ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND TO ADDRESS SOME OF  
17 THE CONCERNS THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED ABOUT OVER ALLOCATING  
18 MARKET RATE HOUSING TO LOWER HOUSING COMMUNITIES AND POTENTIAL  
19 GENTRIFICATION. SO I THINK FOR BOTH ALLOCATIONS SHOULD YOU  
20 WEIGHT AT DIFFERENT LEVELS ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITY AND JOBS  
21 PROXIMITY, BOTH AUTO AND TRANSIT. THANK YOU.

22

23 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS JORDAN GRIMES.

24

August 28, 2020

1 **SPEAKER:** JORDAN GRIMES, PENINSULA FOR EVERYONE. WE'RE A  
2 HOUSING ADVOCACY GROUP IN SAN MATEO AND SANTA CLARA COUNTY. I  
3 AND OTHER HOUSING ADVOCATES IN SAN MATEO COUNTY ARE IN SUPPORT  
4 OF OPTION 3B IT'S CLEAR THIS WOULD GIVE SAN MATEO COUNTY AND  
5 OTHER EXCLUSIONARY SUBURBAN CITIES THE HIGHEST ALLOCATION WE  
6 HAVE BEEN DRASTICALLY UNDER BUILDING FOR FAR TOO LONG. AT  
7 RISK EARLIER OF SOME COMMENTS BY SAN MATEO PLANNING OFFICIALS  
8 ABOUT THE CONCERNS OF FRONT LOADING PARTICULARLY WHEN SAN  
9 MATEO COUNTY HAS ONE OF THE WORST JOBS/HOUSING BALANCES IN THE  
10 REGION TWO, I WANT TO ADDRESS QUICKLY THE SORT OF COMMENTS  
11 ABOUT OUTLIERS AND INCLUDING COLMA. BASED ON -- THIS IS JUST  
12 BASED ON THE TWO FACTOR -- I HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO REALLY DIG  
13 INTO 3B BUT BASED ON THE TWO FACTOR THE ACTUAL NUMBER WE'RE  
14 TALKING ABOUT TOTAL GROWTH FOR COLMA WOULD BE LIKE 116 UNITS I  
15 WOULD REMIND PEOPLE THAT COLMA HAS A BART STATION YES IT'S  
16 SMALL IN AREA BUT FRANKLY 116 UNITS OVER EIGHT YEARS FOR A  
17 CITY THAT HAS A BART STATION IS ABSURDLY LOW. I REALLY DON'T  
18 DISAGREE -- I REALLY DISAGREE WITH THESE NOTIONS THAT YOU KNOW  
19 IT'S NOT REALISTIC TO ASK COMMUNITIES TO DOUBLE THEIR  
20 HOUSEHOLDS THESE COMMUNITIES SHOULD HAVE BEEN DOING THIS ALL  
21 ALONG AS MS. FIERCE MENTIONED IN THE COMMENTS, AND I THINK  
22 IT'S ABSOLUTELY FAIR THAT WE ASK THEM TO MAKE UP FOR THE MANY  
23 YEARS THAT THEY DID NOT BUILD HOUSING. SO I HOPE THERE WILL BE  
24 ANOTHER MEETING ON THIS UPON -- TOPIC. I THINK IT NEEDS MORE  
25 TIME.

August 28, 2020

1

2 **CLERK OF THE BOARD:** THANK YOU. THERE ARE NO SPEAKERS WITH  
3 THEIR HANDS RAISED AT THIS TIME.

4

5 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** CAN I INTERRUPT QUICKLY TO SAY ABAG STAFF HAS  
6 SEEN OUR REQUEST FOR THE SEPTEMBER MEETING AND THEY'LL GET  
7 BACK TO HMC MEMBERS.

8

9 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** I'LL ADDRESS THAT AT THE END.

10

11 **AMBER SHIPLEY:** THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

12

13 **JESSE ARREGUIN, CHAIR:** WRITTEN COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED ON THIS  
14 ITEM AND SUBMITTED TO HMC MEMBERS. THAT CONCLUDES PUBLIC  
15 COMMENT. SO WE HAVE SEEN A REQUEST FOR A SECOND MEETING IN  
16 SEPTEMBER. AND I WILL CONSULT WITH ABAG MTC STAFF ABOUT THE  
17 REQUEST, AND A POTENTIAL DATE, SO PLEASE STAY TUNED FOR  
18 INFORMATION ABOUT THAT. SO THAT COMPLETES OUR MEETING. NEXT  
19 MEETING OF THE HOUSING METHODOLOGY COMMITTEE IS ON SEPTEMBER  
20 18TH, 2020, WITH THAT WE ARE ADJOURNED. THANK YOU. [ADJOURNED]



*Broadcasting Government*