MEMO

To: RHNA HMC Team
From: Civic Edge Consulting
Date: August 31, 2020
RE: August 28, 2020 HMC Meeting #10 Notes

●

Meeting Info
Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) Meeting 10
Friday, August 28, 2020
Zoom Conference Webinar
[Recording Available Here](#)

Meeting Notes by Agenda Item

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call / Confirm Quorum – Jesse Arreguín, Fred Castro**
   Arreguín: Before we proceed, I want to express my deepest sympathy on behalf of the ABAG Executive Board to all those who have been affected by the fires over the last few weeks. And at the request of Supervisor Brown, I would like to take a moment of silence for all of those who have lost their lives in these fires.

2. **Public Comment (Informational)**
   No attendees wished to speak, and no written comments were submitted for items not on today's agenda.

3. **Chair's Report – Jesse Arreguín**
   Arreguín: Noted that the HMC is being asked to provide direction to staff today, to help further refine the methodology. The direction will take the form of a "temperature check" to help staff narrow the options that the HMC would like to consider for formal action at the final meeting. Further noted that at the recent ABAG Executive Board meeting staff presented on the methodology process to date and Arreguin shared how much great work has been done in the past year.

4. **Consent Calendar**
   Julie Pierce: Moved to approve consent calendar.
   Rick Bonilla: Seconded approval.

Zoom Comments before the Refining RHNA Methodology Concepts Presentation
   - **Monica Brown**: If we could have a moment of silence for lives lost in the fires.
   - **Brown**: Thank you.

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

Clarifying Questions/Discussion: Moderate-Income Housing Grouping
Amber Shipley: Let's begin with clarifying questions related to how moderate housing income will be grouped.

Neysa Fligor: Requested clarification about allocating moderate income units the same way that lower-income units are allocated. Why would it result in an increase in the overall number of units assigned to a jurisdiction through RHNA?

- **Gillian Adams**: It may impact the number assigned to a specific jurisdiction, but it will not increase the number of units allocated across the region. There is a fixed number of moderate-income units that we have been assigned by HCD as part of the regional housing need determination. Because we are using different factors to allocate above-moderate income housing and low-income housing, different factors will apply to moderate income units, depending on how we group them. Thus, while the grouping will not increase the number of moderate-income units across the region, it may impact how many are allocated to a specific jurisdiction. They will end up in different places around the region.
- **Fligor**: I had assumed that any potential increase would be offset by decreases elsewhere.
- **Adams**: Because we are using different buckets for each income level, they are not tied together in that way. We are looking at each income category independently, so it does not change how units in other income categories are allocated.

Nell Selander: In using the tool and looking at San Mateo, I noticed that the RHNA allocation is frontloading the Blueprint 2050 numbers. It seems like what we're being asked to achieve in eight years is closer to what you would expect to see over 12 or 13 years of the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint.

- **Dave Vautin**: One of the key decisions made at the last HMC meeting was to use 2050 Households (Blueprint) as a baseline, not amount of growth. So, based on that consensus, you may see a higher share because of that.

Pat Eklund: On the RHNA chart that we received, in Marin County, San Rafael went down on jobs by 15,000 through 2050. Corte Madera decreased by 3,000 jobs. Other cities went up. That's a huge drop for these communities. Why are we seeing this projection?

- **Vautin**: While that's not particularly relevant to the HMC conversation today, I'm happy to give a quick answer for it. In the Draft Blueprint we did see declines in jobs in several Marin County cities. We believe this is due to a reflection of a few different trends in Marin. It is already the "oldest" county in terms of median age and that trend is expected to continue, so there is expected to be a greater share of retirees. Also, as we look forward it is a county with more limited growth so that means with the decline of retail, increased use of e-commerce, there will be a reduction in that sector as well. There are a few different trends at play there, but it is more pertinent to the Plan Bay Area 2050 conversation at the county and subcounty levels.

Elise Semonian: Expressed concern about RHNA requirements in some communities exceeding Plan Bay Area 2050 projections. Questioned how these inconsistencies would impact climate goals. Asked for further clarification about why grouping moderate income units with either lower-income or above moderate-income units impacts the overall total of a jurisdiction and if that could be mitigated by an additional factor.

- **Adams:** I can answer the question about the income regrouping. We have an existing set of factors that are allocating very low- and low-income units. These factors are essentially setting a jurisdiction's total number of units in the very low- and low-income categories. When we shift the moderate-income units from a grouping with above-moderate income units to lower-income units, they are allocated by a different set of factors. However, everything else stays the same. There are two options on the table. One is to maintain bottom-up allocations with moderate-income units paired with above moderate units, which is what we have been doing. The proposed change would be to instead allocate moderate units with lower-income units. This can lead to an increase in the total allocations to a jurisdiction that ends up having a higher number of moderate-income housing units.

James Pappas: Agreed that moderate-income folks face exclusion and some challenges that low-income folks face in the Bay Area. Hoping to hear again from folks who are advocating for this change. Why do they think it will result in additional moderate-income housing? Or is it better to bundle moderate-income housing with above moderate since that is more the tool that we are using to address moderate income needs? Further noted that in San Francisco, where we probably invest as much as any other city or more for affordable housing, we direct that to mostly very low-income, supportive housing and low-income housing. Noted that it seemed unlikely that SF would shift a substantial amount of those affordable housing resources to moderate income. So, it seems unlikely that moderate-income housing would be produced in the same way that very low- and low-income housing is being produced. Can someone speak on behalf of this shift?

- **Noah Housh:** I'm in favor of including moderate income units as a component of the below market rate allocation. The City of Cotati categorizes those units together already in the inclusionary process and looking at the income mix required for affordable housing projects. It makes sense because both moderate- and lower-income housing meet those category requirements. Additionally, the HMC has prioritized putting more housing units overall and more affordable units in high resource areas. Grouping the moderate-income and lower-income units together would allow these communities to have a broader range of income groups to include in their increased allocation of below-market-rate units.

Aarti Shrivastava: In looking at the factors we are using to allocate these units, it appears to me that the moderate-income category has more in common with above moderate in terms of jobs/housing balance, job proximity to transit, job proximity to auto, rather than jobs/housing fit. Additionally, we have identified an area of concern related to displacement in communities by getting a higher share of moderate-income units. Because of that, I am more inclined to group the moderate and above moderate together. While it does not make

a huge difference in overall numbers, it seems the factors used to allocate moderate income housing are more suited to the ones we are using for above moderate.

Ellen Clark: Agree with Pappas and Shrivastava. Moderate income units are so variable from place to place in terms of what category they fit into. Supports combining them with above moderate units.

Fernando Marti: Initially was in favor of grouping moderate with lower-income. However, noticed it does not move the needle much, feels less strongly about it. In response to Pappas's comments, noted that in cities like SF, most new 1- to 3-bedroom apartments do not qualify as moderate-income. The housing market would likely only provide a few as truly moderate-income units. The State has recently begun incentivizing moderate-income housing, for example by expanding a tax credit program directly linked to providing funding for moderate income units. I think it puts an onus on our cities to take advantage of these policies.

Victoria Fierce: Supported Marti's comments. Noted that over the last eight years several policy tools to support moderate-income housing have been developed.

[After technical difficulties, Fierce provided the following comment in the Zoom chat]

I'm echoing what Fernando is saying, that the onus is on the cities to exercise these moderate-income production tools to meet the numbers we set. Eight years is a long way into the future, and we'll have better tools between now and then. Eight years ago, we didn't have SB35 or the Housing Accountability Act, so it's difficult to imagine we won't have better moderate assistance in eight years. Let's be bold and set aspirational goals by including moderate with low income.

Selander: Noted that Dave Vautin was able to answer their previous question in the Zoom chat (see transcript below). Requested additional visual support from staff for discussions.
- **Vautin:** Regarding Selander's question about the baseline, there were some useful materials on this in the last HMC packet. Today we are focusing on the 2050 Household (Blueprint) totals. A few folks had questions around why the baseline is higher than the growth rate in some areas, including San Mateo County. It is because in some parts of the region, the 2050 Household (Blueprint) share is higher than the growth rate over the period. In other parts of the region, the 2050 Household (Blueprint) share is lower than the 2015-2050 growth rate from the Draft Blueprint. The comparison tables of the baseline are a good resource from the last HMC to learn more.

Shipley: Noted the need to move on to the remaining two discussion points. Asked HMC to share any final questions and comments related to moderate-income housing grouping.

Julie Pierce: Noted that this had been a constructive discussion of a difficult topic. Supported staff's recommendation that moderate-income housing frequently needs

support, just like very low- and low-income housing. Noted that she also agreed that in San Francisco, a lot of moderate-income housing comes through inclusionary and through the ADUs. Noted that the HMC will not solve all of the Bay Area's challenges in one fell swoop, but the group does have a mandate from the State to meet our greenhouse gas targets. To meet those targets, we need to correct the pattern of regional growth and reduce vehicle miles traveled. Expressed concern that when people return to work after the pandemic, congestion will be worse than ever.

Noted the need to identify regional priorities – not just housing, but a larger plan for growth. Further noted that traffic, GHG, vehicle miles traveled, and the quality of life for folks working at large job centers are a concern. Particularly, that excessive commute times damage our social fabric and our civic inclusion.

Jeff Levin: Leaned slightly to grouping moderate-income housing with low-income. Emphasized that the primary implication of getting a larger RHNA has to do with which cities are going to provide how much zoning. In the case of moderate-income, it is simply zoning for units. Unlike very low- and low-income housing, it will not necessarily impact how cities zone for multi-family units. Appreciated that when grouped with very low- and low-, the allocation distribution was wider, without moving too far towards urban sprawl. Agreed with the desire to provide a better range of opportunities where we are trying to create opportunity for moderate-income. Emphasized that RHNA process is primarily about who has to do the zoning.

Shrivastava: Noted readiness to discuss other factors and a strong preference for the three-factor approach. Pointed out repeated elevation of access to high resource areas in HMC discussions. Noted it should continue to remain an important factor as well as jobs/housing balance. Further noted jobs/housing balance and transit proximity reinforce the principles of good planning, which is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and place more households in the urban core. For those reasons, urged that transit is not removed from factors.

Noted that PBA already reflects high opportunity areas and the jobs/housing balance. So, these factors are not missing from that base equation in a way that would require us to weight those two issues very heavily in this approach. After reviewing staff materials and metrics, she also felt open to using 1B, but preferred 1A.

Noted that Santa Clara County had sent a letter expressing concerns about the ability to meet projections for the next eight years and reduce greenhouse gas emissions since the transit infrastructure hasn't caught up with the plan.

Shipley: It is time to move towards decision point, but first we need to hear public comment.

Zoom Comments During Clarifying Questions/Discussion
Semonian: I have put the big spreadsheet in Appendix 5 in an excel spreadsheet with the jobs/household data in case it is useful to anyone to review the numbers.

https://www.townofsananselmo.org/DocumentCenter/View/26155/Spreadsheet-for-August-RHNA-meeting

Brown: Thank You

Semonian: https://www.townofsananselmo.org/DocumentCenter/View/26155/Spreadsheet-for-August-RHNA-meeting

Semonian: Spreadsheet of Appendix 5 with jobs/housing added for information

Ruby Bolaria Shifrin: Can I ask clarifying question during the presentation or will we wait until the end?

FACILITATOR Paisley Strellis: Hi Ruby, we will do clarifying questions at the end. Thanks for checking in - we recognize this is a lot of info.

Bolaria Shifrin: Great thanks!

Selander: I second James' sentiments

Bob Planthold: Screen froze at same point. Very unusual.

Tawny Macedo: Victoria, froze again - the first time was at the Housing accountability act.

Michael Brilliot: Can Victoria call in and use zoom just for visual? That's what I have done when I am having similar problems.

Pierce: Victoria, perhaps turning off your video while you are speaking will help keep you from freezing - maximize the bandwidth for the audio?

Fierce: I'm echoing what Fernando is saying, that the onus is on the cities to exercise these moderate-income production tools to meet the numbers we set. Eight years is a long way into the future, and we'll have better tools between now and then. Eight years ago we didn't have SB35 or the Housing Accountability Act, so it's difficult to imagine we won't have better moderate assistance in eight years. Let's be bold and set aspirational goals by including moderate with low income

Bolaria Shifrin: Do you mind sending that link or appendix or table # that shows that?

Bolaria Shifrin: So can look through last times meeting to get it?

Semonian: Yes if you can send a reference to the explanation of the "front loading" that would be helpful since you may be able to find it faster

Vautin: For folks with questions about last meeting's baseline decision: go to https://abag.ca.gov/meetings/housing-methodology-committee-2020-aug-13 and go to Appendix 2. The baseline comparison is at the bottom of each jurisdiction's graph, so you can understand the difference between Blueprint Growth and Blueprint 2050 Households. 10:19:24

Strellis: HMC member Paul Campos who is unable to attend today's meeting wanted to share the following comment: "I support treating moderate the same as low and very low but this is a "yellow card" level preference, i.e, I can live with either."

Clark: Agree with the comments from Piedmont - I generally support the PBA HH Baseline, but there has to be an opportunity for correction of some of these "outlier" results.

Vautin: Use of the 2050 Blueprint Households leads to some jurisdictions seeing more growth in first 8 years of 30-year horizon, whereas some jurisdiction see less growth in the first 8 years.

Selander: Second HMC Ellen Clark that there should probably be a way to correct "outliers"

FACILITATOR: Alia Al-Sharif (she/her): Based on HMC feedback, we're capturing HMC member feedback visually using three cards:

- A green card shows you strongly agree or support the decision

- A yellow card shows you have reservations but are not completely opposed to the decision
- A red card shows that you strongly disagree or oppose the decision

Planthold: Green

Rodney Nickens: green

Planthold: Exact count, please.

Levin: Do we take consensus on the alternative? Grouping mod with above-mod, or is that just the default?

Fierce: Yeah, good question. Not having consensus on one doesn't mean having consensus on the other.

Strellis: Hi Jeff and Victoria, the decision does default to grouping with above moderate-income housing. In other words, without consensus to change it stays the same.

Gillian Adams: Based on that decision point, if you are reviewing the packet materials, you can focus on the Version A options, which show results for moderate-income units grouped with above moderate-income units

Public Comment:

Aaron Eckhouse: I do not have particularly strong feelings about where moderate-income housing should be grouped. If it is grouped with lower-income housing, it will be allocated primarily based on access to opportunity. If it is grouped with market rate housing, it will be allocated based on access to jobs. Noted that both options seemed appropriate.

Addressed some themes in the chat, and what has been heard about the letter from Piedmont. Stated, "I don't think the HMC should give any deference to Piedmont's opinion. Piedmont is one of the most exclusionary jurisdictions in the entire country and if they are saying they should get less housing growth, I don't think you should take that as a valid concern. Some places are going to get more housing growth than they want under this process, that's the reality of this process. If Piedmont has a problem with that, that's their problem. It shouldn't be a regional problem to solve."

Richard Hedges: Urged HMC to put as much housing as possible near transit. Noted another commenter asking why some communities in San Mateo County are coming together. Further noted that it is a matter of political will. Stated that they have been a leader among others in getting that housing passed. They are doing 2100 units around Hayward Park train station, and over 1100 office and retail at Hillsdale station. Said that they have something on the ballot for November, and if it passes, it will allow more housing around downtown. Stressed again that it is a question of political will, about what leadership is willing to do.

Castro: There were six public comments submitted that were sent to HMC members and posted online. There was an additional comment from Paul Campos shared earlier.

HMC Modified Consensus Decision Point: Does the HMC recommend adjusting the bottom-up income grouping so that the moderate-income units are allocated using same factors as low- and very low-income units?

Result: No consensus reached. Thus, moderate-income units will continue to be grouped with above moderate-income units.

Staff noted that the HMC would have the opportunity to revisit this discussion particularly as they discussed item number three, the methodologies, but for the sake of time would need to move on at this point.

10 Minute Break

Clarifying Questions/Discussion: Performance Metrics

Susan Adams: At what point will we go from modified consensus to yes/no voting?

Shipley: It's my understanding that we can stick with the modified consensus voting that you all approved through the end of the meeting. At the end of our final meeting, there will be an agenda item to do a roll call vote, which you will have to approve yes or no, on the record. As long as this process is helpful for you in navigating options and getting the information you need from staff to make the decision, we can keep using it. It's up to you. But it's likely not as valuable in September.

Darin Ranelletti: Requested clarification of the "25 jurisdictions" identified in different metrics categories. Namely, if we discussed that as an HMC and if we agreed upon the rationale behind that. Wanted to make sure that when considering fair housing, these metrics are really capturing the extent of previously exclusionary policies that are impacting the housing market.

- **Adams:** The general concept is looking at the places in the region that are most affected and comparing them to the rest of the region.
- **Aksel Olsen:** It depends on the variable in question. Depending on which metrics is looked at, the coverage will vary. A smaller jurisdiction will be smaller. We just took the top 25 to get a sense of the most outlier parts of the region to see how they perform and how the RHNA allocation is working for that subset relative to the rest of the region. It gives us a good sense of how a quarter of the jurisdictions would perform.
- **Adams**: Just to clarify that the list of 25 varies depending on what objective we're trying to address or what metric we're using. It is not a consistent set of 25 for all metrics. Some refer to the jurisdiction with the most expensive housing costs. For others, it is the most census tracts that are in the high opportunity areas. Like Olsen mentioned, the sort of topic we are talking about for each metric and the scope of how much jurisdiction or population varies in each of those.

Housh: Through this process, I have really tried to keep the three main priorities that we identified back in our March meeting: 1) More units built in high resource areas, both below market rate units and market rate units 2) Avoiding displacement. We had a conversation about gentrification to make sure that this process does not make recommendations that might force people to leave their communities. 3) Putting increased units near transit.

That gets to some of the points Pierce was making on big picture items with regards to reducing VMT. I am less focused or worried about the individual factors or metrics and more worried about the outcome. As we shuffle these allocations, does it really push those three critical things?

Shrivastava: Agree with Housh – I'd prefer to review methodologies first then discuss performance metrics.

Selander: Agreed with Shrivastava that it feels like the group is being funneled instead of understanding the question. Expressed frustration that there was not an opportunity to seek consensus in grouping moderate-income housing with above market housing. Asked for clarification about why the scale is changing and what the scale is measuring. Referenced slide 18 of the presentation as an example.

- **Adams**: The reasons the scales are different is because we are asking different questions. For example, the chart on the left of Slide 18 shows the percent of very low- and low-income units a jurisdiction receives. If it were one, that would mean 100 percent of units are very low- and low- income. Options 2A and 1A come close to having 50 percent of the allocation to these jurisdictions as very low- and low-income units. Comparatively, the chart on the right looks at proportions and examines whether the RHNA allocation is proportional to these jurisdictions' share of the region's the existing households. The dotted line at "one" indicates an exactly proportional representation. In some cases, the allocations are less proportional and in others, greater than proportional.

  Again, we have been using a framework that we have seen HCD use. It compares jurisdictions that have a certain characteristic and looks at the allocations to those places. Also, again, it depends on the topic that we are talking about. The metrics encompass five different objectives covering many different topics. Part of the HMC's role is to find the right balance amongst all those things. Trying to set an objective standard for each of those would be really challenging.

Bolaria-Shifrin: Requested clarification on performance metrics. Noted that although higher-income jurisdictions have higher shares of affordable housing, they do not necessarily have a high overall number. If they only had 10 units for example, and they would score highly on metric 4 if five of those units were below market.

- **Adams:** Correct. To clarify, a lot of the metrics that we started with were asking only this question about the share of lower income units. Now, the metrics we have added are getting to the total allocations. 5C is the proportionality companion to the metric for objective four.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin**: It was interesting to me that on metric 4, Options 1A and 2A score highly, but when you look at metric 5c, those options are actually below the proportionality of 1. So in these options, the higher income jurisdictions are receiving a higher share of affordable housing, but their overall numbers are lower. So, I am drawn to option 3B. In terms of Objective number 5, affirmatively furthering fair

housing, is there a way to call out non-white or historically underrepresented as a metric to identify more exclusionary places that could benefit from having more housing allocation?

- **Adams**: The way we have tried to address segregation in the metrics is by looking at the divergence index. This measures how the community compares on its racial demographic profile compared to the rest of the region. Maybe Matt our legal counsel can step in and talk about the challenges or what would be possible in terms of having metrics based on specific racial groups.

Fligor: Appreciated the process and had two clarifying questions. First, I'm having a difficult time answering the decision point question. Because the metrics are so different, I don't know if I like one metric over the other, because I think there are pros and cons to each of these objectives. I appreciate the way staff has structured this because I think it's important for us to understand each of these decision points. I am hoping to understand how the decision points will play out before we make decisions on them as a group.

- **Adams**: These decision points are challenging because all this information is interrelated. The questions and objectives we are referencing are the five statutory objectives. Generally, I think the question is, are these the right metrics to evaluate those objectives? That answer can influence your decision about which methodology option works best. Several speakers have noted that some of the methodology options performed better on some kinds of metrics and others performed better on other kinds of metrics. Figuring out the right balance is a question before the committee in terms of providing feedback on the specific methodology options. Staff tried to narrow down the decision so there is not too much on the table. These decisions today are not binding – you can revisit them. We are trying to narrow these decisions.

Macedo: Noted that the group seems to be moving away from grouping moderate income with the lower-income groups. But regardless of whether moderate-income is grouped with lower income, HCD will be looking at the allocation of the lower-income groups. Wanted to ensure that the metrics are not including moderate-income with the lower-income groups.

- **Olsen**: The metric is the same regardless of the methodology.
- **Adams**: For all methodologies, when we look at how the allocation is doing at assigning lower-income units, that metric is always measuring the very low- and low-income units regardless of how the moderate-income units are allocated. Even when moderate-income units are allocated using the same factors as lower-income units, the metrics do not change and the metrics focus only on very low- and low-income units.
- **Macedo**: Expressed confusion over why the results for the A version methodologies are different from the results for the B version methodologies.
- **Olsen:** The allocation for the region has a different distribution. When we look at the types of cities that grow more, the distribution is different to begin with, so the metrics come out a little differently because the growth distribution is different. The metrics being referred to are looking at the total number of units.

Shrivastava: Stated that this is complicated. Open to using the comprehensive metrics with the three-factor approach. Needs to know what three is before supporting two.

Levin: Referred to slide 25, Metric 5B to ask about Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. "Do the jurisdictions exhibiting racial and economic exclusion receive allocations proportional to share of households?" Asked how we define what is an exclusionary jurisdiction. Ideally, we would use a metric that directly looks at racial exclusion to target high income places with below average share of Black and Latinx residents. At minimum, it must use a metric that captures more than just a small sliver of the population. Looking at just the top 25 cities might not move the needle very much.

Next, how do we decide if the city is or is not getting a fair share to address past inequities? In terms of a "fair share," I don't believe we should be looking at the total allocation. We should be looking at whether the allocation of low- and very low-income units for a jurisdiction is proportion to the jurisdiction's 2019 household share. The principal issue around exclusion has been a predominance of zoning for single family housing and a lack of multi-family housing. This creates a barrier to affordable housing that disproportionately impacts people of color. So looking at whether the share of lower-income housing is proportion is a more meaningful metric compared to the overall total.

Third, what are the implications if a city does not score highly on it?

Right now, this performance metric looks at a set of cities in aggregate. That allows some exclusionary jurisdictions to continue to be exclusionary. A city that is identified as exclusionary, must get a proportional share of low and very low that will require re-zoning to build multi-family units. We may need to consider if we need to adjust the allocation if this metric does not get us where we want to be.

Marti: It would be helpful to understand what percent of the population is this particular metric referencing? I was one of the signatories on a letter with Jeff. In our letter we referenced studies that looked at the cities that have exhibited exclusionary practices. The studies identified exclusionary cities as composing about 40 percent of the Bay Area, in population. Our concern is that the top 25 cities are amounting to closer to 12 percent of folks in the Bay Area. I think that's a question, then: is the metric that we're using in order to meet objective five, the correct one?

And we proposed a number of ways to look at this. Rather than looking at where there are both high divergence scores and high-income populations, why not add those together to create a composite score that broadens the number of cities that we're capturing? Then consider which cities are being left out from the original way we are calculating this metric. Another question is what is the consequence when we're not meeting some of those objectives? We end up with a list of jurisdictions that meet these criteria for being exclusionary, but the chosen methodology maybe captures half of those jurisdictions, let's say, as an example. Is there a way to go back and capture the other half, that's some kind of baseline? We have proposed that we want to at least meet the share of households in those

cities for low- and very low-income units, so they're not getting less than their proportional share for cities like the ones we have we have identified as needing to meet the guidelines of objective five.

- **Adams:** Before we move on, I'd like our legal counsel Matt Lavrinets to weigh in on the question of a metric that specifically targets race rather than the divergence index we have been using so far to measure segregation.
- **Lavrinets**: Anytime that you're making policy calling out race specifically or focusing on a specific racial/ethnic group, that poses some risk and increases likelihood that methodology would be subjected to legal challenges if race is called out directly. I would caution the HMC against doing that, when there are non-racial ways of accomplishing the same goal. So again this is just something that the HMC should be aware of and there is potential legal hurdles to doing that and may increase the likelihood that the methodology would be subject to a legal challenge.

Diane Dillon: Requested that the group move on to a discussion of the factors.

Pappas: Struggling with this structure – it feels as though we are choosing how to grade ourselves before doing the work. My understanding is that the statutes are not clear enough. Staff cannot say, "Here are the things we have to hit to show that we're meeting the five objectives." I think everything we have heard from members about the quality of metrics ultimately comes down to the number of units. To me, many of these factors about units in cities showing greater exclusion can be measured by income. As for the conversation about race, we did have the divergence index as one of the potential factors which does take into account the demographic difference of a city relative to the region. I think income is the leading factor, and high housing cost, thus the number of units need to not only be proportional, but potentially larger. So minimum proportional and potentially larger, I think should be added to those factors.

- **Adams**: To clarify, it's true we are trying to think about the best measures of meeting these objectives or furthering the objectives. The purpose for having us look at the metrics themselves before diving into each of the methodology options was that the metric, evaluation, and the analysis can inform your feelings about methodology options. So to Pappas's point about which ones - if you think some of them should be more than proportional, some of these barely come up to proportional and some are much more proportional than others. It's less about trying to use metrics to make our options look good but to help you understand what's going on with the options as a way of informing the decision about which options you prefer.

Romero: I want to echo recent comments from Pappas and Bolaria-Shifrin and others and propose another way of doing this. I hear legal counsel's advice and admonition, but there may be other counsels who would disagree with that assessment. If we exclude, black, brown, Latino, Latina, Latinx terms, we could potentially use the divergence index. And potentially include a composite score that also includes a percent of households that are above moderate income for each jurisdiction. We would have to do some adjustment on the back end, which is filtering out those cities with the lowest quartile of median income so that we don't wind up burdening these other lower income communities, when what we're really

trying do is make sure that those exclusionary communities or cities absolutely get a fair share of low- and very low-income units. So, that would be my compromise for this objective to try to capture what has been discussed here. I would like to propose that as a substitute and criteria for 5b.

- **Olsen**: We take the upper half of cities in terms of income and the divergence index. So we are seeing whether a city rises to the top in terms of divergence index score and whether it is also at the same time at the top in term of income. So both those conditions need to be true to be considered exclusionary. So that becomes the universe of cities we are looking at and 5C does that already.
- **Romero**: Is it a composite score?
- **Olsen**: It's two separate checks – it's like a Venn diagram. If a city meets both conditions then they are considered.

Shipley: I see hands up, but in light of the time, I want to suggest we move on to methodologies. I'm not sensing a strong consensus around any of the performance metrics, but we can do a temperature check if that would be helpful. Otherwise, we can just move to the last part of our conversation, which is diving into those methodologies and talking through the options.

Brilliot: I think it would be worth looking at where we are.

Pierce: I don't think we are failing to meet any of these metrics. All of these things in one way or another meet the criteria, so it is an opinion issue on which metrics are most important. But we meet them all to some extent. The biggest question towards question three is how far can we go towards meeting everything in one cycle Because there is a point where you can ask too much of some and where you're really not going to get anywhere close. So we need to look at the broader vision and what our regional growth pattern needs to look like. Are we meeting the equity standards? I think we need to remember we can't do it all in one week. We're talking about the next eight years here. We are not talking about the next 30 years.

Shipley: Let's quickly check to see if we have consensus on the performance metrics?

Arreguín: I have heard two things: a desire to take a temperature check and a desire to go to number three. My question for staff is, do we need to vote now? It seems that the decision we make on number three will probably inform the evaluation criteria.

- **Adams:** I don't know that the decisions on number three are going to inform the evaluation criteria, but a decision on number three is a conversation about building the methodology. So, again, we were trying to get to some evaluation metrics that we thought would be helpful to you in trying to figure out how you want to build the methodology, or kind of which areas may need tweaking or which of those three options you feel we should spend the most time on, in our discussions. So as staff, I hear that there are a lot of different options, and I do hear there are questions about how we can change the evaluation metrics. However, I don't see that we're going to get clarity on that in this meeting. It would be helpful to move to decision point three

so we can identify what you need from staff about to be able to make a decision. And if folks who have different ideas about the metrics that we should be running, perhaps we can work together to present an even wider set of metrics at the last meeting. I think decision number three is more important at this point.

[FURTHER DISCUSSION ABOUT VOTING LED TO A DECISION TO MOVE TO DECISION 3]

Brilliot: Requested again that there be a temperature check.

Marti: I think we have raised some important questions and should hear alternative proposals next time. [GARBLED]

Shipley: I need to defer to Chair Arreguín on whether to move on.

Arreguín: It seems there is still a desire to talk about decision number two, so we should take any further comments on that.

Levin: Procedurally I would like to take a temperature check as well as hear from the public speakers. I am really concerned on affirmatively furthering fair housing that the metric we are using is looking at exclusionary cities in the aggregate, and what we are saying there, is it is okay for city one to be really off as long as that's offset by city two. And, that's problematic. I don't think we want any of the exclusionary cities to be getting allocations that aren't proportional. It's not just a question of how the exclusionary cities look in the aggregate.

Shipley: Hearing that people want a temperature check, I think that we should quickly hear public comment and take a look at consensus.

Zoom Comments During Clarifying Questions/Discussion
Shrivastava: Can we get a list of the top 25 jurisdictions?
Strellis : HMC member Paul Campos who is unable to attend today's meeting wanted to share the following comment: "I don't support using the evaluation criteria--I think the statutory factors are so subjective that any attempt to portray the results through the criteria creates an artificial veneer of objectivity. This is not a criticism of the criteria staff developed but more of a comment about the wisdom of the overall effort. I think folks need to judge the results themselves directly against the statutory criteria and come to their own conclusions without an intermediate filter."
Planthold: That variability of which jurisdictions are the top 25 in each factor make it difficult to keep in mind which are the top 25 in x the top 25 in y and so on. Meaning lookinging at the overall responsiveness of any one jurisdiction is less knowable.
Selander: I second Aarti!
Brilliot: My understanding is that decision point one related to mod can be discussed again in the context of decision point 3: which of the 6 methodologies does the HMC select
Strellis: Hi Michael, thanks for drawing attention to that opportunity. Members will be able to revisit decision point one as they tackle decision point three.

Shrivastava: For the record, I don;t have a problem using the top 25 cities as a measure. I don't think we need one objective measure

Al-Sharif: Hi Aarti -- We have added your request for a list of the top 25 jurisdictions to the requests of ABAG staff list for this meeting. Following up on what Gillian shared with the group, the top jurisdiction list shifts depending on the metric/measure.

Selander: Another good reason for staff to share their screen when they're answering questions! Could really, really help folks understand what's being discussed.

Strellis: If it's helpful, folks can refer to Item 5a2, appendix 5

http://mtc.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=8ee4eb27-d0eb-4059-addb-db6fd82bc785.pdf

Strellis: Or slides 17-27 of the presentation

http://mtc.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=0f5c0513-1723-429f-98df-00618ef65dbb.pdf

Planthold: Panelists are expected to be quickly adept at remembering and finding a previous chart, for multiple charts. Better if a staffer can be quickly not only post the link on chat but use a picture within picture option, if available, to show charts. Or, to have the referenced charts quickly linked in sequence so that panelists can click on that one link to get the charts referenced in that topic or series of questions.

Brilliot: I think what Tawny is saying is that when measuring equity we should not include mod with low income in measuring this metric?

Eli Kaplan: Whenever it says percent of lower-income units, it is referring only to very low-income and low-income units, as Gillian notes.

Al-Sharif: We hear you Nell and Bob and will aim to do a better job of sharing/linking to the charts as they are being referenced by staff and HMC members.

Levin: I think the point is that when we are measuring TOTAL allocations, the outcome is impacted by how we allocate moderate

Selander: thank you, Alia!

Housh: I completely agree with James. We should work on our allocations and then polish that decision to ensure statutory compliance.

Levin: I agree as well

Macedo: To James' point, that's the furthering part of the objective, that high opportunity/exclusionary area get more units.

Semonian: Full text of the factors for RHNA - since they have been abbreviated in the slides: The regional housing needs allocation plan shall further all of the following objectives:

(1) Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.

(2) Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, the encouragement of efficient development patterns, and the achievement of the region's greenhouse gas reductions targets provided by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 65080.

(3) Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing, including an improved balance between the number of low-wage jobs and the number of housing units affordable to low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.

Shrivastava: I did not understand the last speaker's suggestion and how it would revise the metrics

Semonian : (4) Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent American Community Survey.

(5) Affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Levin: Do we have a motion on the floor??

Marti: The proposal we are making is that it should be ADDITIVE - cities that score high on divergence PLUS cities that score high on income, MINUS cities that have a lot of low income

Levin: I thought I heard a specific proposal for an alternative

Levin: It depends on whether we agree that we are using the right criteria to capture the objective

Kaplan: This is a list of the statutory objectives that Elise referred to and Julie is referencing: https://rhna-factors.mtcanalytics.org/data/RHNA_Statutory_Objectives.pdf

Brilliot: We should not select a methodology than go back to modify the evaluation metric to support our methodology

Levin: Are we not even taking a temperature check on the metrics??

Brilliot: I think we should Jeff

Semonian: What about public comments?

Levin: I would like to at least see a temperature check, and also hear from public speakers

Levin: We are having a hard time hearing you Fernando

Clark: Can't hear Fernando

Planthold: A temp. check will raise other questions -- as to wording, as to a modification/ amendment to the temp. check. Yet, we have only 25 mins.

Macedo: Given HMC is deciding on the methodology at the next meeting, we don't have much time left to discuss the factors.

Planthold: IF we vote to replace an existing criteria and substitute, does that give the public "notice", or must such a substitution be Noticed for a decision for next mtg?

Littlehale: I favor most of the criteria - I take Jeff Levin's point about measuring individual cities on criteria 5. I am less concerned about use of the Divergence index & the High Resource Area.

Semonian: I have issues with some and not others

Semonian: Metric 2a: Where's the data? What is "highest growth rates?"

Fligor: I agree with Elise. I have concerns with some and not others, which = yellow for me.

Planthold: Green

Public Comment on Decision Point 2
Aaron Eckhouse, California YIMBY: Thanked staff for bringing back metrics that look at quantity and not just percentage of affordable units. It better reflects where we want to go with Fair Housing. I think those are going to be really helpful and provide much higher quality information for evaluation.

Shajuti Hossain, Public Advocates: I want to express concern with evaluation criteria 5b, as it only captures at most 11% of regional population when far more than that are impacted by racial segregation and barriers to opportunities. The composite score would be more accurate to address the larger sections of the region's population who are experiencing the harmful impacts of segregation. I think it is very important that staff continue working with HMC members to develop a composite score and more effectively combat racial segregation.

Jordan Grimes, Peninsula for Everyone: Strongly agree with Jeff Levin to make sure exclusionary communities don't get off the hook like they have been for decades.

Second decision point - does the HMC recommend using the comprehensive performance evaluation metrics as drafted to ensure methodology options meet the statutory objectives and advance regional policy goal, but staff will continue to work on metrics related to Objective 5?
- **Al-Sharif**: I don't see any reds, but I do see nine yellows.
- **Shipley:** The decision point moves forward. The HMC is recommending using the comprehensive performance evaluation metrics as drafted, and the committee members who have strong feeling about metrics related to Objective 5 will communicate with staff.

HMC Members – Clarifying Questions and Discussion for Decision Point 3: Factors and Weights
Shipley: We're moving into a conversation about the methodology options and the HMC has to make this decision in September, so the more that you can refine your thoughts on these options to help staff prepare you for the September meeting, it would be great.

Romero: I just wanted to address the chair quickly on the proposed method of proceeding. I had made a proposal to change metric 5b, so is the chair saying that indeed we could approach staff in the interim and try to get something to bring back at the at the next meeting. Is that correct?
- **Arreguin:** Yes.
- **Romero:** Great. Thank you.

Selander: Stated that it seems that no matter which factor is used, the options result in a couple of extreme outliers in San Mateo County in terms of their assigned growth. Felt that the higher income "exclusionary communities" have a very moderate amount of growth anticipated across all six options whereas lower income "exclusionary communities" have 10 time that amount of growth. Wondered whether the factors and the way they're weighted

on the back end is skewing the results, as one community ends up with over 160 percent growth. Suggested considering a cap on growth or another way to treat extreme outliers.

- **Vautin:** Noted that this reference is to Colma and Brisbane, and that not all small jurisdictions in the region see large amounts of growth. Clarified that the jurisdictions with higher growth levels tend to be places with a very small share of existing households today, with some key growth geographies in Plan Bay Area 2050, and are often located near BART or Caltrain stations. Explained that in Brisbane there is a major development planned near the Caltrain station. Acknowledged that the RHND is a large number and that there are some key locations in the region close to transit that are envisioned for pretty significant growth in the long-range plan, resulting in high growth levels in a few of these small jurisdictions.
- **Selander:** Concerned that these communities are lower income, and that lower income communities have accepted more transit and are being made to accommodate higher growth.
- **Vautin:** Noted that there are 101 cities in the region with a lot of unique characteristics, and some higher income, smaller jurisdictions have also raised concerns about their potential RHNA allocations as well, as noted in Piedmont's letter. Emphasized that there is focused growth around transit in the Blueprint, and so some places with robust transit are seeing fairly high growth levels.

Dillon: Noted that even though there was an HMC consensus on natural hazards as a factor, requested that the recommendation be reconsidered given the recent fires. Stated that places that have burned are places where it is less expensive to build and where jurisdictions would have designated moderate-income housing to be built, but 300 units have been lost in that area. Housing in that area is unlikely to be rebuilt. Would like to see a natural hazards factor as well as an urbanized land area factor. Suggests an option where all of the income categories use 50 percent access to high opportunity areas, 30 percent job proximity - transit, and 20 percent natural hazards. Believes this would address natural hazard issues and result in housing close to transit and jobs for all households.

Macedo: Reminded HMC that HCD will be reviewing to see if the methodology meets the five statutory objectives of RHNA. Recommend that if HMC sticks with the recommendation of using the 2050 Households (Blueprint) versus 2019 Households as the baseline, they should consider emphasizing factors for access to opportunity and jobs-housing fit to counteract any potential shifting away from communities that have not invested in public transit infrastructure. Also noted that factors related to the speed by which the jurisdiction approves housing permits or their current zoned capacity shouldn't be in the RHNA allocation based on statutory guidelines. Cautioned that a methodology based on land use projections could result in the allocation not furthering the five statutory objectives. Emphasized that weighting access to opportunity and jobs/housing fit to counter-balance these effects will be important so the end result is an equitable allocation. Noted that Plan Bay Area is directing growth toward transit, so it might not make sense to add additional transit-based factors.

Housh: Echoed Diane Dillon's comments. Believe the choice to use Households 2050 for the baseline is skewing the results. Believes that some options give Sebastopol growth beyond their build-out capacity because of infrastructure limitations and sewer capacity to be able to grow with the allocation. Stated that some factors are setting jurisdictions up to fail and pushing units to locations they shouldn't be because of climate change and natural hazards. Recommended the HMC come up with a way to remove these outliers.

Fierce: Pushed back on need to address these outliers, as the starting point for the Bay Area includes extreme outliers due to how cities have been built in last 40 years. Explained that while some cities are racially and economically diverse, others are outliers with 80 percent or more of the population being white, while Atherton is the wealthiest city in the nation. Noted that outliers in the methodology results are addressing the fact that region already has outliers. Indicated full support for bigger RHNA numbers on the Peninsula. Emphasized that HMC needs to be aspirational and owes a responsibility to the community to house them. Encouraged HMC not to back down from cities opposing this process.

Litthehale: Echoed that HMC should not be overly concerned about outliers. Stated that cities will be appropriately zoned as a result of RHNA, and even if they fail to meet the allocation it opens up opportunities created through legislation to streamline approvals and see if something feasibly can be worked out that would take care of housing needs and reinforcing a different pattern of building a construction workforce that is not a low wage, low productivity strategy. Expressed support for methodology Option 3B, but proposed using jobs proximity-auto instead of jobs-housing balance for the above-moderate income units.

Arreguin: Recommended that HMC should not make a decision due to lack of time left in the meeting, but HMC can provide comments and feedback that staff can use to bring new information to the next meeting.

Shrivastava: Argued for importance of increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing, making sure that the low-income allocations are properly distributed to communities that haven't accommodated them historically, addressing the jobs-housing balance, and focusing growth in the urban core near transit. Expressed support for the three-factor approach or adding a transit-based factor to other existing options. into the equation.

Bolaria-Shifrin: Wanted to clarify whether 2050 Households (Blueprint) was the baseline or whether that decision was being revisited.
- **Arreguin**: Clarified that the HMC recommended using 2050 Households (Blueprint) at the last meeting.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Noted that the methodology options don't appear to appear to dramatically build in unincorporated areas. Wanted other HMC members to clarify their issues with outliers in the methodology.

Selander: Expressed that point about outliers has been misconstrued. Pointed to contrast between Colma and Atherton, where both are small communities with access to rail but Atherton is expected to grow 10% and Colma is expected to grow 60%. Noted that lower

income communities add retail and office space to be able to pay for services, while places with higher property values don't need to.

Bolaria Shifrin: Clarified that the example brought up by Selander is a different issue. Stated that question focused on unincorporated areas and HMC members' fear of sprawl. Wanted to know where folks are seeing that. Expressed support for 3B and does not see obvious issues with sprawl in this methodology.

- **Walsh:** Noted that in all the methodology scenarios unincorporated Solano Country grows between 20 and 23 percent, which is double or triple the growth for any of the Solano County cities. Emphasized that these unincorporated areas don't have city sewer or water services and rely on septic and wells. Asserted that this growth in unincorporated Solano County represents an outlier that advances poor planning practices, sprawl, and increases in greenhouse gases.

Clark: Noted agreement with comments about transit. Agreed that Plan Bay Area reflects transit, but also stated that the current methodology options skew things away from transit-rich areas. Supported putting a transit-based factor in the methodology to help reach regional goals related to commute patterns and reducing greenhouse gases. Also pushed back against comments stating that some communities don't support transit since these are county-level decisions rather than local decisions. Noted that transit dollars are allocated by counties, with the money tending not to go to more suburban areas. Added that the comments about outliers have to do with a "reality check," as small geographically-constrained communities cannot realistically be expected to grow far beyond their regional growth expectations. Felt that communities like Piedmont are not saying they do not want any growth, but that they want allocations that are realistic.

Brilliot: Requested that staff address the concerns being raised about growth in unincorporated areas at the next meeting and clarify why the Blueprint does that. Noted that unincorporated Santa Clara County receives around 4,000 units in the methodology options. Indicated some concern about this figure but also felt it would be okay if there was more explanation. Explained that San Jose has been working with Santa Clara County to focus on infill and establishing urban growth boundaries, and the county wants to preserve unincorporated areas for agriculture and open space.

Fligor: Stated support for Option 1A and indicated desire for a methodology that includes transit. Also supported having a second meeting in September to allow for more discussion before making a decision.

Eklund: Echoed support for more time for discussion and for methodology Option 1. Also stated support for putting housing where jobs are as well as in high resource areas. Asserted that housing shouldn't be put where you can't build, like agricultural land and open space. Noted that Option 3 doesn't put enough housing where jobs are and puts too much emphasis on high resource areas.

Bonilla: Agreed with Littlehale about modifying Option 3B and having a methodology that is 50 percent access to high opportunity and 50 percent job proximity-auto. Also felt that 3A is a good option.

Semonian: Noted support for including a job factor to meet statutory objectives and environmental goals. Claimed that current methodology options will result in more building in high resource areas than has occurred in 50 years so this factor does not need additional weight, but jobs should be emphasized.

Marti: Echoed others' support for having job proximity as a factor and the need for both auto proximity and transit proximity. Cautioned that only focusing on transit proximity leaves out a lot of areas. Emphasized that the high opportunity factor needs to be the biggest piece of the methodology.

Levin: Echoed support for an additional meeting for more discussion. Stated that transit is already incorporated in the methodology. Agreed with Scott Littlehale's idea explore using job proximity instead of jobs-housing balance, since jobs-housing balance and jobs-housing fit are based on jurisdiction boundaries. Noted that job proximity by auto can still be a greenhouse gas reducing strategy if people are able to drive five miles to work instead of 50. Asked for staff to clarify what it means for HMC to vote with yellow cards. Indicated support for Option 3B but is wondering if all of the B options are now off the table.

- **Shipley:** Yellow means there is no consensus and the HMC can continue to have conversations about the decision. It is not off the table.

Romero: Agreed that a modified 3B with job proximity by auto makes sense, echoing comments by Scott Littlehale, Jeff Levin, and Rick Bonilla.

Shipley: If HMC members have additional comments or feedback about the methodology options, please submit them to staff in writing.

Zoom Comments During Clarifying Questions/Discussion
Shrivastava: I noticed that all HMC members didn't vote
Brown: NO
Shrivastava: Yes to Jesse's question
Fligor: I have to drop at 12:15. I support having another mtg in September
Walsh: I must leave at 12:05
Welton Jordan: I can stay probably 15 extra minutes as well
Al-Sharif: Hi Bob -- we don't think there is a need to notice for the public regarding any criteria tweaks made by HMC members.
Olsen: Elise: 2a compares growth rates for the 25 cities with the largest job shares relative to the rest of the cities / jurisdictions. There is not a set threshold for "highest."
Strellis : HMC member Paul Campos who is unable to attend today's meeting wanted to share the following comment: "I strongly support either 3a or 3b. For me the access to opportunity factor should be the dominant factor. I would actually like to see the above

moderate be allocated with 50% high opportunity rather than 40% but at 40% I'd show a yellow card. Anything less than the 40% for above moderate and 70% for the other categories would elicit a red card from me. I can support either Jobs Housing Balance or Jobs Housing Fit for the jobs criteria. I do not support applying more than two criteria for very low/low/moderate and above moderate respectively as I think doing so acts to dilute the impact of the most important criteria on the target income group(s). That is another reason for my support of 3a and/or 3b. Of the two I prefer 3a based on my answer to question 1 but this is not a strong preference. I would also support 3b."

Brilliot: I have a question related to Nell's comment

Brilliot: Never mind I am good

Al-Sharif: Hi Aarti -- any HMC member can stand aside and abstain from offering their opinion on the decision points.

Fierce: Future growth is commensurate with past patterns of housing production suppression.

Levin: Does a large number of Yellow cards mean a decision is blocked, or that it needs more consideration?

Bolaria Shifrin: Low income areas need more housing too...

Levin: Agree with Ruby, and low-income communities facing displacement pressures specifically need more low/very low income housing.

Strellis: Hi Jeff - HMC members agreed that if half or more of HMC members are showing yellow, a decision point is blocked and more discussion is needed

Littlehale: In case we run out of time: I ask HMC members to consider a modification to 3(b): For Above-Moderate, instead of 60% Jobs-Housing Balance, consider 60% Jobs-Proximity-AUTO. This has the fortuitous effect (among others) of bringing Piedmont's OVERALL RHNA up from pink (below avg growth) to avg growth.

Littlehale: Re the above: It makes logical sense to me to consider that certain bedroom communities that are jobs-proximate by auto (rather than having within-jurisdiction jobs, as specified in jobs-housing balance).

Fierce: Agreed. Every unit that Piedmont doesn't build gets pushed into Oakland, directly furthering gentrification.

Littlehale: (My settings accidentally didn't include attendees, so re-posting comment made a minute ago)

Littlehale: In case we run out of time: I ask HMC members to consider a modification to 3(b): For Above-Moderate, instead of 60% Jobs-Housing Balance, consider 60% Jobs-Proximity-AUTO. This has the fortuitous effect (among others) of bringing Piedmont's OVERALL RHNA up from pink (below avg growth) to avg growth.

Re the above: It makes logical sense to me to consider that certain bedroom communities that are jobs-proximate by auto (rather than having within-jurisdiction jobs, as specified in jobs-housing balance).

Selander: Second Noah's sentiments - we need to address outliers

Susan Adams: Thank you, Noah and Diane!

Walsh: Agree with Noah. Unregistered Solano cannot handle RHNA that is being proposed. No sewer/water available.

Brown: The LNC fire is only 35% contained. t

Bolaria Shifrin: Agree with Victoria- higher % growth is result of decades of undergrowth - need to makeup for the past failures

Fierce: Yeah, Atherton should be at least 20%

Housh: To clarify, the "outliers" I feel we should address are those which go against accepted "best practices" in planning such as pushing housing into the un-incorporated areas away from urban centers and transit creating sprawl and those which would push new housing into locations threatened by hazards

Brown: My fear that since the uninc Solano lost over 200 structures, roads destroyed that there might be a push to add more growth.

Littlehale: Clarifying question for Aarti: Isn't transit baked in to the PBA 2050 as well as being included in High Resource Areas' composite index?

Bonilla: I agree with Scott Littlehale. I looked at 3b modified as suggested and feel that outcomes are improved.

Ebbs: We are not here to solve every community's individual problems.

Selander: Agree @Forrest, but what it demonstrates when you have outliers like this is that maybe the factors are off if the intended outcome is not achieved

Brown: I am in the county building, looking east, the hills are black. Fire jumped I 80 and almost took out City Of Fairfield homes. We just lucked out. Solano has ag.

Bolaria Shifrin: Got to run - I like 3B the most. Would like to see the adjustment Scott recommended and total allocation and eval rubric

Bolaria Shifrin: Thanks!

Ebbs: Unincorporated County areas can always promote annexation into incorporated cities and, thus, acquire the municipal sewer and water needed for development. There are many examples of urban county areas - look at Sacramento County.

Bolaria Shifrin: Build up! Not wide :)

Fierce: Piedmont is welcome to become annexed by Oakland if they're running out of space, but before that they could indeed build a few stories higher.

Brown: My vote is for 1B. Stay safe, Monica

Jordan: I initially supported 3B, if the decision to group moderate and above then it would be 1A. Thanks

Fierce: These are all things already determined by a city's local zoning powers; RHNA shouldn't be concerned with how a city wants to achieve its goal, merely that they have a goal that addresses our housing shortage.

Littlehale: To clarify in the wake of Rick Bonilla's verbal comment: for the sake of minimally modifying 3(b) - I recommended altering Above-Moderate so that we keep "High Resource" at 40% & swapping Jobs Proximity (AUTO) for Jobs-Housing Balance at 60%.

Planthold: Neither the chair nor the ABAG staff have taken control of this meeting. We added 5 mins., to 12:05, then to 12:15. We are past that, still without public comment. At some point, panelists need to themselves monitor time and send in their comments via e-

mail, so as to respect the time needs of other panelists and attendees. It's as if panelists do not accept the need for time management nor for public comment.

Selander: Can staff summarize the alternatives posed by the various HMC members and send them around via email sooner rather than later so that other HMC members can really spend some time on them?

Brilliot: I would support a second meeting in September. We still have a lot still to decide.

Selander: I think a second meeting in sept would be helpful

Clark: Agree with having an extra meeting.

Levin: Several people have called for a second meeting.   Can we make a decision on that?

Fierce: I support one more meeting. not like anyone's planning on traveling soon.

Al-Sharif: Nell -- we see and have recorded your request of staff.

Housh: I agree with the comments from Aaron Eckhouse

Housh: I am also supportive of another meeting

Al-Sharif: HMC Members -- We see that there are multiple requests for a second meeting in September. ABAG staff will loop back with HMC Members after this meeting.

Levin: Thank you.

Public Comment on Decision Point 3

Aaron Eckhouse, California YIMBY: Agreed with comments about using a combination of access to high opportunity and jobs-proximity. Asserted that jobs-proximity is the best factor to use for jobs since it better captures enabling a short commute. Also felt that jobs proximity will do a better job of reducing sprawl and growth in unincorporated areas than the current natural hazards factor. Stated that the proposed natural hazards factor directs more growth to unincorporated Solano and Sonoma than to Palo Alto or Berkeley, so this factor does truly address people's valid concerns about hazards. Indicated support for using access to high opportunity areas as a factor for allocating moderate- and above moderate-income housing in addition to lower income units.

Jordan Grimes, Peninsula for Everyone: Stated support for Option 3B since it gives San Mateo County and exclusionary suburbs the highest allocation. Asserted that these areas have been underbuilding for too long and Option 3B would correct this. Disagreed with concerns from planning officials from San Mateo County about frontloading since the area has among the worst jobs-housing imbalance in the region. Also wanted to address comments about Colma and clarify that the total growth for Colma is 116 units, and stated that 116 units over 8 years for a city that has a BART station is absurdly low even if the city is geographically small. Disagreed that asking communities to double their households is unrealistic, and noted that it is fair to ask this of communities that have historically underbuilt.

6. **Adjournment/ Next Meeting**
   * **Arreguin:** Noted the request for a second HMC meeting in September and asked HMC to stay tuned for more details on this meeting. Meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM.