



MEMO

To: RHNA HMC Team
From: Civic Edge Consulting
Date: September 10, 2020
RE: September 4, 2020 HMC Meeting #11 Notes



Meeting Info

Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) Meeting #11
Friday, September 4, 2020
Zoom Conference Webinar
[Recording Available Here](#)

Meeting Notes by Agenda Item

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

2. Public Comment (Informational)

Castro: No written or verbal comments on non-agenda items

3. Chair's Report – Jesse Arreguín

Arreguín: Announced meeting logistics and goal to narrow down methodology recommendation. This meeting was scheduled at request of HMC members for further discussion. Reminded the group that next meeting will be formal voting. Reiterated that the overall goal is to allocate the RHND units across the Bay Area and meet needs across entire region. Ideally, HMC can narrow the options down to a few methodology options. Thanked members for their time.

Public Comment on Chair's Report None

Nell Selander: Suggested turning off the Zoom chat because it has been distracting.

Ruby Bolaria Shifrin: Suggested a few Zoom chat norms to keep it manageable. For example, using it for technical difficulties, and final thoughts before signing off.

Arreguín: Agreed, and set the Zoom chat norms.

Aarti Shrivastava: Suggested that people message only Amber Shipley (facilitator) so staff is notified, but participants are not distracted.

Monica Brown: Noted that chat feels helpful. Preferred to keep it as is.

Arreguín: Noted that people tuning in to listen may not be able to see the chat. In the interest of transparency, must be aware.

Rick Bonilla: Since speakers do not have time to fully convey thoughts, they found the Zoom chat useful.

Victoria Fierce: Agreed with Brown and the ability to multi-task, urged to keep the chat.

Diane Dillon: Is that chat part of the official record of the HMC?

- **Arreguín:** Yes
- **Shipley:** Yes, the Zoom chat is part of the meeting notes that are circulated with the meeting packet.

Dillon: Wondered whether HMC members are reading through the chat to consider all points of view before they participate in the modified consensus decision-making process.

Arreguín: Suggested taking a straw poll to see if a majority of HMC wants to continue using the chat.

Jeffrey Levin: Noted that the chat has been helpful to ask clarifying questions without disrupting the conversation. Leaned towards continuing to use it.

Arreguín: Quick show of hands to see if we should keep the chat or not. Majority want to use the chat. Noted that HMC should use the chat judiciously. Encouraged everyone to participate in dialogue today.

4. Consent Calendar

Bonilla: Moved to approve consent calendar and past meeting minutes.

Susan Adams: Seconded approval.

Public Comment on Consent Calendar

Castro: No written or verbal comments on this item.

Motion to approve minutes passes with two abstentions- Jane Riley and Andrea Ouse

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

Arreguín: Asked for clarification from staff about when Public Comment will be.

- **Gillian Adams:** After walking through the materials in the packet about the methodology options, HMC members will discuss these options and give feedback about potential modifications. Before HMC members do consensus decision points to see if they would like to have a methodology option brought back to the next meeting, we will do Public Comment.



- **Arreguín:** Urged the HMC again to narrow the methodology options down today to no more than three.
- **Carlos Romero:** How will we address the evaluative criteria that we discussed at the last meeting?
- **Arreguín:** The presentation from Adams will address this since we deferred action on it until this meeting.

Zoom Chat Before Discussion

- **Fierce:** Thank you, I wasn't able to find the email from the Zoom Coordinator this morning
- **Michael Brilliot:** No objection...just kidding
- **Alia Al-Sharif:** Hi HMC Members -- as a reminder, since we will continue to use the chat please ensure all messages posted in the chat are to all panelists and attendees or everyone if that is how it appears on your screen. Thanks in advance!
- **Jane Riley:** Agree with Elise's concerns

Discussion on RHNA Methodology Concepts

Arreguín: Wanted more discussion on number 5. As noted, there is a proposal from a few HMC members. There was no objective to other criteria at the past meeting.

- **Adams:** We could have both metrics to inform the discussion. It could be additive rather than a replacement.
- **Arreguín:** Invited members who proposed the change to speak on it.

Fernando Marti: We created a metric that pulls from a larger pool of cities than the metric proposed by staff to identify jurisdictions that deserve more lower-income unit allocations. So, this is a composite, additive method to look at cities with either a high divergence index score or a high number of above moderate-income households. A drawback of the divergence index is that it can also highlight cities with a large proportion of low-income residents, so the last part of the composite score is to remove those jurisdictions. The data comparison has been sent to all HMC members. The metric was part one, and part two is can this be used beyond an evaluative criterion and also inform the methodology.

- **Levin:** First, we wanted to find a better way of identifying jurisdictions we are most concerned with, as Marti explained. Next, we wanted to look at exclusionary mechanisms. Specifically, the lack of zoning for multi-family housing to accommodate a wider range of income levels to move in. If we are only looking at proportion of lower-income units allocated to a jurisdiction, some cities can meet it with single-family housing, which does not address the exclusionary factor we want to address. Third, urged HMC to not apply this metric as an aggregate. Doing so may enable cities to "make up" for each other in terms of allocations and proportions. If each city is not proportional on its own, then we are not meeting our equity goals. Whichever methodology option we settle on, if there are cities that do not hit proportionality, we need to make additional adjustments to the formula to make sure exclusionary jurisdictions get proportional lower-income allocations.



Arreguín: There are two main decision points: first, do we want to modify the evaluative criteria 5B or add a sixth criteria, and then there is a change to the actual methodology. Would staff suggest that the HMC decide this question to modify evaluation criteria 5B or add an additional metric first before we go on to the methodology conversation?

- **Adams:** Since we have had an explanation of what the proposal is, let's move to a decision.
- **Arreguín:** Let's do Public Comment and then do a straw poll to see if there is consensus.
- **Shipley:** We have heard people advocate for this additional metric, so let's hear from people who have concerns about it. Then we can come to a decision point.

Selander: Clarifying question around where units would come from for communities that do not reach proportionality under that proposal. Would units come from the jurisdiction total or would it be moved from another jurisdiction?

- **Adams:** A fixed number of low- and very low-income units are assigned from HCD. The units would have to come from a different jurisdiction to meet this threshold.

Elise Semonian: Concern that baseline does not encompass job creation. Asked how this proposal would work with unincorporated areas and county jurisdictions like Marin. In Marin, the top five whitest areas are unincorporated areas. Would higher resource and more exclusionary areas get allocations too?

- **Adams:** RHNA is done at a jurisdiction level. Therefore, the calculation would be done at the jurisdiction level. When a jurisdiction is creating its housing element is the time to determine the most appropriate locations for low- and very low-income units.
- **Semonian:** From an allocation perspective, does the county or unincorporated get their "fair share" of the higher allocation based on their places?
- **Adams:** The entire population for an unincorporated area would be taken as a whole, and not sub-divided by area.
- **Semonian:** That is a concern because we are looking at sub-areas for incorporated places.

Adams: Clarified that the current question is whether to use the proposed metric to evaluate methodology options. The question about whether the metric should be used to modify the methodology is a different question that we will address during our conversation about methodology options.

Dillon: Most people on the call focus on cities. However, we have no space in unincorporated areas that have water and sewage to accommodate even a small apartment complex. LAFCO prohibits the city from extending services. Our Senator had a bill that allows that. This plan is not physically, legally possible in unincorporated area. Warned against viewing process primarily through a city lens.

Julie Pierce: Is the intent of this scenario to take the proportional allocation for a jurisdiction and then subdivide the income levels, proportionate to this new proposal? Adding on the low-



income units is problematic and counteractive to job access by creating long commutes. While the goal is to make jurisdictions more equitable, once jurisdictions' allocations are more than 50 percent low- and very low-income RHNA, and those allocations are in the fringes of the region where there are not as many job opportunities, it does not seem equitable. Voiced serious reservations if this is the case. Long commutes are not equitable.

- **Levin:** We cannot reduce a jurisdiction's moderate and above moderate-income share to increase their low and very-low shares. That is the income shift methodology we rejected, and why we are using the bottom-up approach instead. If we were to increase low- and very low-income units for a jurisdiction, we would need to figure out where to take it from. It may make sense to get them from jurisdictions that scored the lowest on this combined metric. We have not run this to see how many units this would make a difference for. Many of the cities are smaller so the numbers would not make a huge difference overall. Acknowledged the need for job proximity and greenhouse gas reductions. Noted that those are not the only goals, and HMC must find a methodology that addresses all statutory objectives.

Neysa Fligor: Expressed support for the proposal put forward by the four HMC members. Asked clarifying questions about how this proposal would be applied. If the goal of this additive evaluation criteria is to bring certain jurisdictions up to a proportional lower-income unit allocation, is there a cap on that? Expressed concern if the goal is to blindly get to that proportionality line no matter what. Is there a way to do low- and very low-income allocations first, and then do this additive approach proposed by HMC members and see where the numbers are at, and then do the other income category allocations so we can ensure that a jurisdiction doesn't end up with a much higher overall allocation? Curious if there is a way to hold off on doing the moderate- and above moderate-income allocation until after allocating lower-income units.

- **Adams:** We have a fixed number of units for each income category, not just low- and very low-income. The bottom-up methodology allocates difference income groups by different factors. Acknowledged the concern that they may end up with a number that is too large. It requires the HMC to decide what is "too large." There have been conversations alluding to asking too much of a place. Cautioned an overly complicated path, because of the need for a simple narrative to explain it to people who have not spent a year researching this issue.
- **Fligor:** Agreed that simplicity is best.

Riley: Intrigued by the proposal and reminded folks that it would not be a factor. It would be a criterion for evaluation. Voiced concern about adding the criteria individually to communities unless there is a cap and would like to bring a cap back in if HMC goes this route. As a housing advocate, knows that opportunity is the biggest factor, but it must be tempered with proximity to jobs and resources.

Susan Adams: Agreed with Riley, as another housing advocate. Some cities are ready to welcome new housing, and other cities are not. Echoed Dillon's statements, that Sonoma County has many unincorporated areas that do not have access to water or sewer. A tenfold increase



would be nearly impossible for those areas. Asked if mitigation credits are on the table and urged that they not be.

- **Marti:** No, mitigation credits would not be on the table.
- **Levin:** Not intended as a mitigation credit. It would be an argument against that. Applying it in the aggregate, allows some cities to underperform because other cities in the jurisdiction overperform. This method rejects that one city can do enough so another city does not have to. We suggest a basic minimum that all cities must meet – the opposite of a mitigation credit.

Bolaria-Shifrin: Voiced support for proposal. Wanted to confirm that the proposal includes two things. One, a composite score that identified 49 jurisdictions, instead of the 31 jurisdictions identified in the staff-proposed metric. And then the second piece is looking at whether these 49 jurisdictions each receive a share of very low- and low-income units that is proportional to their share of the region's households. Is that correct?

- **Levin:** Yes, that is what we proposed.
- **Bolaria-Shifrin:** Restated support for proposal. Noted that access to jobs is also an important metric. In many areas, besides the unincorporated areas, new housing across the Bay will have high access to jobs. Cited a study on economic mobility from Raj Chetty that showed how the best predictor of economic mobility is access to high resource areas. More than school quality, the biggest predictor of economic mobility for low-income people is having friends that are high-income. Used this study to support integrated communities to further the equity goal. The concern around unincorporated areas seems solvable and not worth vetoing the approach. Urged the proposers to address the unincorporated area concerns to help our region grow in equitable ways.

Brilliot: Confirmed that there are two current discussion points. One is whether to use the suggested modification as a metric. The second point is whether to use that metric to adjust the low-income allocation of high-income cities that are underperforming on the metric and not reaching a proportional share of lower-income units. People might feel more comfortable with the modification if people saw the numbers it results in. Shared that Santa Clara County has similar concerns raised by other HMC members about growth in the unincorporated county. Unincorporated Santa Clara County's growth in the different methodology options has gone up close to 1,500 percent since the last RHNA cycle to close to 5,000 units. Santa Clara County is planned to be an agricultural area. There are agreements with Santa Clara County and San Jose that growth will go in urbanized areas and San Jose will not expand its boundaries anymore. There is a real concern about the number of units being put in Unincorporated Santa Clara County. Maybe there should be a factor that takes units out of unincorporated counties that are not planned for urbanization.

Romero: Proposal does not de-prioritize jobs. The approach is additive and brings us closer to equity in where low-income housing is placed all over the nine counties of Bay Area. There are unincorporated areas, such as in San Mateo County, that have development. Adjustments in density could address the affordability component. Like Levin has mentioned several times, it is a zoning issue, not just a sprawl issue. Urged group to vote on metric piece now, and then refine the methodology and application later.



- **Shipley:** Yes, we are moving towards a decision point on the performance metrics and will then discuss the methodology.

Selander: If growth is measured based on alignment of today's conditions, it reinforces exclusionary norms. If 2050 is the baseline, it should be based on regionwide growth expectations. An exclusionary community should not be allowed to stay at a base rate if other communities near them grow.

- **Adams:** That was proposed by HMC members to measure proportionality. Deferred to someone on HMC to speak on it.
- **Marti:** We ended up with a pretty conservative minimum as a floor. The methodology may end up with a higher number. Comparing 2019 and 2050, there was a heavy emphasis on growth in the South Bay which de-emphasized other areas, such as the Tri-valley. So, the group landed towards 2019 households for the proportionality measure.
- **Levin:** The baseline itself is driven by policy that has historically been exclusionary. To ensure we move away from that, we are looking at what would be the fair share. Specifically, we are looking at cities that have not been providing their fair share of low- and very low-income housing. These cities have underperformed particularly for multi-family complexes. Ultimately, are cities doing their fair share to make sure the region hits goals for all income levels? We want to be sure that everything else in the methodology does not move us away from addressing equity.

Shipley: Any final thoughts before we move towards a decision point?

Bonilla: Voiced support for the proposal. Noted that there is time to adjust the details and believed that this route would lead to better outcomes for low-income working people, housing stability, and equity.

Shipley: Decision point: Adding a performance evaluation metric, proposed as a modification of 5B, but it could also be number 6.

- **Marti:** Does not matter if it is added or replaced. The separate and more important question is how it impacts the methodology.
- **Shipley:** Let's decide if we should consider it as number 6. We are coming to a decision point on just the metric, not the methodology. Then, once we talk about methodology options, HMC members can bring it back up.

Public Comment: Additional Evaluative Criteria on RHNA

Arreguín: Introduced public comment.

Darrell Owens: Voiced opposition for increasing housing in unincorporated areas that would increase VMTs and carbon emissions. Noted that the primary concern was not infrastructure and utilities, but sprawl development that would be counter to Bay Area climate goals.

Shajuti Hossain, Public Advocates: Supported new proposal because it will help address racial segregation in the region as RHNA requires us to do.



Aaron Eckhouse, Regional Organizer with YIMBY: Supported the additional proposal since it will affirmatively further fair housing. Since the HMC had expressed a preference for low- and very-low income housing allocation as the main factor for evaluating affirmatively further fair housing, appreciated how staff found a way to address this by focusing on total amount of units rather than just percentages. This will help ensure the recommended methodology will be approved by HCD.

Rob Eastwood, Planning Manager, Santa Clara County: Emphasized that their General Plan pushes urban growth exclusively into the cities. It is based on strong equity principles, preventing urban sprawl, agricultural preservation, and keeping housing out of fire areas. Increasing RHNA allocation for a rural county will flip those principles. Noted that the County is not built for urban sprawl and they are adamantly against it. Santa Clara County cannot handle 1000+ percent increase in RHNA. Expressed a desire to continue coordinating with the rural counties.

Castro: No other written comments besides the ones that have already been posted online.

Decision Point: does the HMC recommend adding the new evaluation metric under consideration?

- **Shipley:** We are at our decision point. We are not adjusting any methodology options. This is about adding one more metric that was proposed. Noted the limited number of red "votes" and that the recommendation from HMC is to add the new evaluation metric. Moved the group to a conversation about methodology. Noted that there are six options to discuss. Asked HMC how time should be allocated, knowing that the goal is to refine the number of methodology options to consider. Asked HMC to note which methodologies they prefer to discuss given the time constraints.

Eklund: Clarifying question about process.

Staff shared screen to present all the options on the table.

Shipley: Re-iterated the goal to refine the list down to two or three options to make a final decision from.

- **Adams:** Clarified that the question right now is: "Which option do you want to talk about first?" It is a way to prioritize the conversation. Noted that the group is not formally deciding right now, just choosing what to talk about.
- **Eklund:** So if we do not talk about it, it will not move forward?
- **Shipley:** Ideally, by the end of today, we will have a good sense of what to bring to next meeting.

Darin Ranelletti: Noted that there would not be time to talk about all methodology options. Suggested voting one by one and moving forward with the top three options.



- **Brilliot:** Suggested using dot voting, which has been helpful at community meetings to help guide the conversation.
- **Shipley:** Given the technology and Brown Act limitations, it is not possible.
- **Brilliot:** Can we do a verbal roll call in the interest of time?
- **Levin:** Suggested a quick straw poll for each methodology. Reasoned that some options will fall out quickly, so there is no need to allocate an equal amount of time discussing it.
- **Shipley:** Yes, that would work.
- **Arreguin:** Agreed to move forward with that plan to allocate time efficiently. Asked legal counsel if Public Comment is needed for each methodology.
- **Matthew Lavrinets, Legal Counsel:** Clarified to take public comment before a straw vote.
- **Arreguin:** Opened Public Comment to inform HMC discussion and decision.

Zoom Chat Before Public Comment

Bolaria Shifrin: Reminder that growth doesn't have to be extending boundaries but rather growing 4plex and duplexes can add growth rapidly vs going wide.

Brown: Same for Solano, will repeat no water, etc. and we grow food.

Riley: Unincorporated Sonoma County allows triplexes in single family neighborhoods, by right. It does not get us to VLI and LI

Matt Walsh: Rezoning to higher density doesn't work in unincorporated areas without services.

Fierce: 8 years is quite a long time for this plan to play out, I'm confident our county governments can find a way to provide those services in that time window; the alternative is a continued crisis-level housing shortage. RHNA is an exercise in planning, but it isn't the only plan that needs made.

Bolaria Shifrin: I have to leave. I'm supportive of adding the equity metric and supportive of 3a, 6a, [and 3b if that's still around]. TY

Walsh: For suburban/urban areas, I agree. For ag areas urban services are not good planning.

Riley: Agree Matt.

Semonian: Do we have the calculations for these modified formulas? I'm trying to see what San Francisco's allocation would be

Andrea Ouse: Sorry, I don't have a paper. I'm an alternate.

Leah Zippert: You can write red, yellow, or green on a piece of white paper to hold up.

Paisley Strellis: Hi Andrea - you can use any piece of paper you have handy (back of an envelope is fine!) to write the number of the methodology you would like to use first. And also red, yellow, and green for future consensus questions

Al-Sharif: As a reminder for HMC Members and notification to members of the public -- 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

Strellis: Elise, in answer to your question, no staff has not looked into the modified formulas. As this was a proposal from HMC, it will be up to the committees to determine how it will impact the methodologies.

Riley: 6A and 5A



Semonian: Might be easier to vote out options

Fierce: +1: with what Jeff said. time's running out on today.

Public Comment: RHNA Methodology Concepts

Eckhouse: Thanked staff for bringing new options that include a focus on job proximity and preferred 6A. Noted that methodologies that do not directly consider access to opportunity did poorly on affirmatively furthering fair housing, which is both a legal requirement and an HMC priority. Encouraged HMC to look at methodology that includes factors for opportunity access, particularly, job access. This would address the risk of sprawl and growth in unincorporated areas in the North Bay too.

Shajuti Hossain, Public Advocates: Noted that their first choice is 6A, followed by 5A and 3A. Reasoned that those options all balance access to opportunity and jobs. We have a good mix of both given the baseline 2050 Households. Re-iterated a high recommendation for 6A.

Castro: No written comments beyond what was already posted.

Decision Point: Which RHNA Methodology Concepts Should the HMC Discuss Today?

- **Shipley:** Let's move to a decision point - which methodology do we want to spend time talking about? There are six options. If it is blocked, there is a consensus that we are not bringing it forward to talk about at the next meeting. Reviewed logistics of modified consensus decision making.

Option 1A: Jobs Emphasis

- Decision point quickly blocked. HMC will not have a conversation about this option.

Option 2A: High Opportunity Areas and Jobs

- Decision point blocked. HMC will not have a conversation about this option.

Option 3A: High Opportunity Area Emphasis

- Decision point blocked. HMC will not have a conversation about this option.

Option 4A: Jobs Proximity Emphasis

- Decision point blocked. HMC will not have a conversation about this option.

Option 5A: 50/50 High Opportunity Areas and Jobs

- Moves forward with consensus. HMC will have a conversation about this option.

Option 6A: Modified High Opportunity Areas Emphasis

- Moves forward consensus. HMC will have a conversation about this option.

Shipley: We will move forward with a conversation on 5A and 6A.



15 Minute Break

Arreguín: Brought the meeting back in session. Reiterated that the conversation will be focused around methodology options 5A and 6A.

- **Shipley:** Let's do clarifying questions first, and then discussion on 5A. In attempt to bring only a few options to the next meeting, reiterated that there can still be a modified consensus decision point on changes.
- **Arreguín:** Noted that there may be some discussion on other factors. For example, they received a letter from Napa County around fire risk.
- **Adams:** Reminded the group that this is the option that focuses on high opportunity areas and jobs. Showed a map focusing on specific growth rates in jurisdictions, for reference.

Levin: Request for next time. All maps reflect growth rates, would it be possible to see maps with actual allocations? That way, HMC can see distribution of units and not just the growth rate.

- **Forrest Ebbs:** Pushed back on this request since the goal of the HMC is to create high level principles to disperse the units, rather than focusing on individual allocation numbers.
- **Shipley:** Noted that HMC and staff will review request to prioritize what can move forward.

Susan Adams: Expressed a desire to see the numbers. Asked if it would be possible to see what the numbers look like with 2019 Household numbers, rather than just relying on the 2050 Blueprint.

- **Riley:** Requested that staff take 6A and 5A with 2019 Household Baseline, instead of the 2050 Blueprint. Wanted to see the impact for unincorporated areas from using a different baseline.

Shipley: Invited people to advocate for or against 5A as the methodology.

Selander: Clarifying question on 5A and 6A. Why was job proximity – auto used, instead of job proximity – transit?

- **Scott Littlehale:** Job proximity – transit was already accounted for in another factor through the high resource index.

Shrivastava: While it is appropriate to allocate units to high resource areas, transit is mostly removed, with all due respect to Littlehale's comment. Noted that growth factor has a big impact on communities, especially in Santa Clara County. 5A and 6A expect some communities to grow unreasonably quick in eight years. Santa Clara County has the most growth, and the numbers are too high to be achievable.

Asked why high opportunity areas in 5A and 6A continue to be a factor for moderate- and above moderate-income housing. It only seems appropriate for low- and very low-income housing. Requested a modification of that piece. Did not bring up a proposal but would like to bring back jobs-housing balance with methodology 2A.



Fligor: Agreed completely with Shrivastava. Although the committee has narrowed additional factors to consider, advocated to bring back transit as one. Asked Littlehale to further clarify how higher resource areas accommodate the transit factor. Since it does not seem to be reflected in the output, it should be a separate factor instead of a sub-section. How big of a factor is transit in the high resource areas?

- **Littlehale:** Noted that the goal is to keep the methodology simple, so using indexes that fold in multiple factors is beneficial. Shrivastava is correct that high resource area index does not explicitly deal with transit. However, the methodology document for the high resource area index from the Tax Credit Allocation Committee and HCD does include job proximity measures by looking at the number of jobs filled by workers without a bachelor's degree that fall within a given radius. This encompasses typical very low-wage workers, defined here as making less than \$15,000 annually. Therefore, this factor captures people commuting by transit. Admitted that it was only one of the many factors in the high resource areas. Noted that they were open to amendments to 5A or 6A that explicitly considers proximity to transit for low- and very low-income unit allocation.

Ranelletti: Noted that the explanation may be tough for elected officials on ABAG Board as they try to explain high numbers to their constituents. Recommended sending a preferred methodology to the Executive Board with some back-up options so the Board does not do its own methodology. Elected officials will also be concerned about growth in unincorporated areas, which may impact the high-opportunity emphasis. Is there a way to exclude unincorporated areas, or better explain the spheres of influence for cities that are receiving growth? From a political and good planning perspective, urged HMC to address this issue.

Shipley: Let's have a short discussion on if this is the preference because it seems like enough people have interest in the 2019 baseline. Noted that there would be four methodologies in September instead of two.

- **Riley:** Expressed frustration with not having data requests met and making decisions without proper information. Especially since other members have requested data, and the request was not put to a committee vote.
- **Brilliot:** Echoed Riley's request for data on 5A and 6A using a 2019 Baseline. Since the process is iterative, HMC should go back and review.
- **Levin:** Noted that they do not object to running options 5A and 6A against 2019 Households as a baseline to also include 5B and 6B.

Dillon: Supported Littlehale's comments, noting that people who can afford to telecommute and avoid transit are doing that. People using transit cannot do this, so a transit factor captures those folks. Preferred percentages instead of numbers, since numbers tend to skew ideas and may be harder to contextualize.

Eklund: Expressed that HMC should include factors to address unincorporated areas. Specifically, what areas are available for building? Urged another factor to eliminate fire hazards. Agreed that transit and proximity to jobs needs to be included explicitly. Because of this, stated concern about impacts on smaller cities from methods 5A and 6A. Highlighted Belvedere in



Marin County, which would now be expected to do 160 to 180 units. Noted that would be impossible because cities like Belvedere, Ross and Tiburon are already built out. Therefore, these growth expectations are setting up those cities for failure.

Levin: Question about the units the Bay Area will have to accommodate in this eight-year cycle. What growth rate does it represent for the region as a whole?

- **Aksel Olsen:** Regionwide, it is about 17 to 18 percent.
- **Levin:** For people who are concerned about percentages, please note that if the units were distributed so all jurisdictions got an equal growth rate, we would all be getting 18 percent which is a huge growth rate. In the past, it is the number we have gotten to over 20 to 25 years, but not in eight years. It is a number that came down from the State, so we need to work with it. Understood concern for a 25 percent growth rate but reminded people that it is not too far off from the regional average.

Reiterated the desire to adjust for cities that do not hit proportionality. Expressed a willingness to work with staff to decide where those units would come from.

Shipley: Clarified that staff is noting formal requests as they arise.

- **Levin:** Let's call this proposal the "Equity Proposal."
- **Shipley:** Great, we will walk through the requests together to make sure staff understands what is being asked.

Fierce: Echoed Levin's comments to reconsider 2019 household level as baseline. Would like to see 6A with jobs-housing fit replaced with jobs proximity-transit for low- and very low-income.

- **Littlehale:** Urged HMC members to consider it a friendly amendment.
- **Arreguín:** 30 percent job proximity – transit, right?
- **Adams:** What I heard was job proximity-transit, only for low- and very low- income units?
- **Littlehale:** Yes.

Marti: Acknowledged that job proximity is important but concerned about balancing it just for transit proximity since many low-income folks access jobs by autos. One way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is to reduce super commutes. Emphasized the desire to balance transit proximity and auto proximity with the high resource areas factor.

Selander: Reiterated Levin's point about expected growth overall and balancing our expectations by jurisdiction. Expressed that existing percentages of housing units does not further our goal or 18 percent overall growth. The metrics and methodology are not capturing what areas grow more than 18 percent and what areas grow less. Noted feeling uneasy about using job proximity-auto in any scenario since it is the least efficient way to move people and is generally unhelpful.

James Pappas: Wanted to clarify reasoning for including access to high opportunity areas factor for moderate- and above moderate-income units. Noted that the big three cities were singled out for a lot of growth in the last RHNA cycle, but some of the more desirable and



expensive parts of the region may not be in those big three cities. So, those areas may not be carrying a significant amount of growth across all income levels. Including access to high opportunity areas factor for moderate- and above moderate-income units can ensure that highly desirable and exclusionary communities are doing more of all types of housing across income levels. Including a factor for high opportunity also ensures that moderate- and above moderate-income housing is not being shifted to weaker markets or the places more susceptible to gentrification.

Acknowledged desire to emphasize transit and use the jobs proximity-transit factor, but also noted that the auto proximity factor acknowledges how most people get to work. Also asserted that putting more housing in places proximate to jobs by car can lead to growth that allows for increased transit infrastructure. Emphasizing only transit reflects our current limited transit infrastructure and does not address the disconnect between where jobs are and where housing is today. The auto proximity factor is a better way to even out some of the jobs-housing disconnects and set us up to grow in a more efficient way in the future.

- **Selander:** Makes sense, thank you. Noticed the jobs-proximity auto factor because it seems to be used to assign moderate- and above moderate-income units, but the jobs proximity auto factor is never associated with the lower income range.
- **Pappas:** Committee members have made that argument, but staff and HMC members alike want to keep the methodology as simple as possible, even with all the factors. It needs to be easy to explain to laypeople.

Monica Brown: Expressed a concern with 5A. Reviewed that the HMC has consensus about access to high opportunity areas and job-housing fit at 50 percent. What has changed, and will there be a 5A1? How many options will there be? Then, can we discuss 6A given our time constraints. Noted that it takes them \$50 to get to ABAG on the train. If they were lower income, they would not be able to afford that compared to carpooling or other options.

- **Shipleigh:** We got a request to shift the baseline and add an equity adjustment proposal. There is not clarity about impacts of job proximity-transit on 5A.
- **Arreguin:** Added that Dillon requested a factor for extreme fire hazards.
- **Eklund:** Urbanized areas was also mentioned several times.
- **Shipleigh:** HMC needs to decide about how many 5A options will remain on the table. Is there a more formal proposal for fire hazards that the group can evaluate?
- **Arreguin:** There seemed to be consensus for staff to come back with 2019 household baseline for 5A and 6A.
- **Shipleigh:** Would that baseline be extended to the other options too?
- **Semonian:** Understood that the group has opposition to moving the 2019 baseline further but urged it to be included for the next HMC meeting. The baseline seems to be driving so much housing into unincorporated areas. It is not maintaining the status quo for housing units, it adds balance to jurisdictions that have created tons of jobs, and very little housing.
- **Vautin:** We can share data on a couple different baselines. There is some data in the August 13 packet showing that switching to 2019 Household Baseline would lead to the following RHNA changes in unincorporated areas: moderate increases for Alameda and Contra Costa, slight increases for Marin and Napa, slight decreases for San Mateo, Santa



Clara, and Sonoma, and moderate decreases in Solana. Overall, four counties would see an increase, and four counties would see a decrease.

- **Shipley:** Asked for clarification.
- **Semonian:** Concerned that leaders and communities will not be able to see the relationship between job growth and baseline.
- **Shipley:** So this would be a third 5A option. Would anyone like to speak for or against this?
- **Arreguín:** After long discussion, we arrived at 2050 Households as a baseline. HMC needs to narrow the options to decide at the next meeting.
- **Pappas:** Reiterated that the 2050 Households baseline is a compromise outcome as a happy medium between the two.

Shipley: Let's move on to jobs proximity- transit as a factor. Asked Fligor to specify what the other 5A proposal would be.

Fligor: It would add in job-proximity transit as a third factor. Perhaps it would involve reducing the percentage for jobs-housing fit. When initially proposed it, would be across the board for both categories, but is open to only add it as a third factor to low- and very low-income units.

- **Adams:** To clarify, option 4A had those three factors included for very low- and low-income. Noted more details about this option and stated that HMC did not move it forward as one to keep.
- **Fligor:** Was it the percent breakdown that people rejected as opposed to the factors to consider.
- **Adams:** What weights would you recommend with those three factors in mind?
- **Fligor:** Keep 50 percent access to high opportunity areas. Then, 30 percent for jobs-housing fit and 20 percent for proximity to transit. Heard other HMC members advocate for the transit factor as it impacts statutory objectives, environmental goals, and concerns with unincorporated areas.
- **Shipley:** Would anyone else like to speak on shifting factors on 5A for low- and very low-income?
- **Shrivastava:** Agreed and suggested 50 percent high opportunity and 25 percent to jobs proximity and jobs-housing fit. Urged HMC to add jobs proximity to the lower-income categories.
- **Pierce:** Concerned with job proximity - transit because many lower income people cannot use transit to get to work. They either need to bring their own supplies or work odd hours. It is discriminatory to make it only transit. Even if they live near a transit center, it would not be accessible for them. Cautioned against being idealistic.
- **Arreguín:** Seems like there is not consensus on this issue. Let's do a temperature check.
- **Pierce:** Clarified that generally, job proximity is a fine factor but does not want to specify only transit.
- **Fligor:** Yes, it was initially proposed for across the board, but another member suggested focusing on low- and very low-income category. Would like to get it as a factor, and open to making it a factor for both.
- **Arreguín:** Has the proposal been modified? Or is it still 50 percent access to high opportunity areas, 30 percent for jobs-housing fit and 20 percent for proximity to transit?



- **Fligor:** That would remain for low- and very low-income. What Pierce mentioned that if we add it as a factor, it should be added to be a factor for moderate-income as well.
- **Pierce:** Clarified that jobs proximity should be a huge factor. Discouraged dictating how people get to work by income category because it does not correlate. Reiterated that job proximity on its own should be a factor.
- **Fligor:** Agreed. Do you have a suggestion on how we incorporate jobs proximity- auto/ transit proximity into 5A?
- **Shrivastava:** Pierce, are you talking about jobs-housing balance? What do you want to have proximate to jobs?
- **Pierce:** Ideally, housing. But if housing will be in the high opportunity areas not near jobs, then there is no need to clarify if it is by transit or by auto.

Arreguín: Since people are jumping in, let's restore order to this conversation.

Shibley: The goal is to get clarity on the proposal. In the interest of time, we will continue with the list of requests. Next is the Equity Adjustment proposal and if it should be considered for the September 18 meeting.

- **Levin:** Suggested that both 5A and 6A would look at what kinds of shifts would be necessary for areas that do not hit 1.0 proportionality in low- and very low-income units. Noted they were open to discussing with staff to offset the adjustment elsewhere.
- **Shibley:** Any opposition to the third 5A option to add equity adjustment proposal?
- **Romero:** Asked to clarify the baseline.
- **Shibley:** It seemed like there was a consensus to see 5A with a 2019 baseline, so staff will do that. Is there a desire to see 5A with the equity adjustment?
- **Romero:** Even though I personally prefer the 2019 baseline, the political reality is that ABAG Executive Board compromised on the 2050 baseline. Since ABAG Board would ultimately approve this, it is not viable since they have already weighed in.
- **Arreguín:** Agreed, there was a compromise and a decision. The request is to see the information. Noted they do not want to go back to 2019 Households baseline because there was so much discussion that got HMC to 2050 Households baseline.

Pappas: Back to Pierce's point. The bulk of allocations are still high opportunity areas. Jobs-housing fit has nothing to do with transit, so most of the housing allocations would provide access to lower wage workers regardless of transit accessibility. Suggested a combined factor of transit and auto access, or a converse of VMT factor. It sounds like people want housing directed to lower VMT areas. Supported 5A as is and Fligor's proposal, noting that we are getting late in the game. To Pierce's point, would there be enough other factors that transit would not be the primary deterrent?

Shibley: Is anyone opposed to seeing the equity adjustment proposal data?

- **Levin:** Clarified that it would be applied to both options.
- **Kaplan:** Screenshared the packet for the metric proposal to show communities that would receive the equity adjustment.
- **Adams:** Any proposed changes would affect the outcome.



- **Levin:** Yes, we are looking at the cities in white [on Kaplan's screen]. There are advantages to looking at job proximity instead of jobs-housing fit. For example, if a city itself does not have low-wage jobs but is right next to a city that does, it will not score on that metric. Noted that HMC has not looked at scenarios that use jobs proximity-auto for low- and very low-income. We have no assessment if that will make a meaningful difference. If we are going to look at alternatives, let's look at ones that make significant differences. Suggested substituting a blended jobs proximity factor with jobs housing fit factor to give us enough of a difference.
- **Pierce:** Makes sense.
- **Shipley:** Can you clarify the breakdown?
- **Levin:** For 5A very low- and low-income, it would be 50 percent high opportunity, 25 percent jobs proximity - auto and 25 percent jobs proximity - transit.
- **Adams:** To clarify, it would not change moderate and above moderate?
- **Levin:** Correct.
- **Fligor:** Supported that as well as modification to 5A.
- **Levin:** If we are going to look at alternatives, let's look at ones that make significant differences.

Shipley: Two options on the table right now. Let's tackle equity adjustment for both options. Conversation has alluded to how complicated it will be. Asked if HMC wants to spend time on an option that reflects that proposal. Urged to move to a decision point in order to move on to 6A.

Zoom Comments before Public Comment

- **Levin:** I'd suggest we just vote Red/Green on whether to have further discussion on each of the 6 options
- **Fierce:** Great idea.
- **Shipley:** We were scheduled to take a break at 11 AM - but let's get through these decision points and then break...
- **Kaplan:** Would any HMC members want me to bring up the map again and share my screen? Happy to do whatever is preferred.
- **Semonian:** If we're opening up baselines - how about 2050 PBA Blueprint household grown as a baseline for all to consider too.
- **Walsh:** Yes. Lets see the 2019 household data!
- **Ouse:** Agree with Elise.
- **Brown:** Play with the graph high opportunity had a better result
- **Al-Sharif:** Elise -- we have added in your request to the request for staff list. Matt -- we also have Jane
- **Al-Sharif:** **Matt -- we also have Jane's request for 2019 households added and will add your name to it.
- **Littlehale:** Definition for the High Resource area index as it captures Proximity to Jobs: "This indicator was calculated in two stages. The first stage uses Longitudinal EmployerHousehold Dynamics Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LEHD-LODES) data from 2015 calculate the population-weighted median distance traveled by workers



earning \$1,250 a

month or less (or the equivalent of \$15,000 a year). In non-rural areas, the median distance is

calculated by region. For rural areas, the median distance is calculated based on all rural areas in the state, to reflect their greater typical travel distances."

<https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2020-tcac-hcd-methodology.pdf> page 9-10

- **Fierce:** Hi again, my zoom crashed right after I finished speaking
- **Fierce:** but I did hear the response, thanks
- **Bonilla:** A region with a crisis level chronic housing shortage is one that has NOT built enough housing over a very long period of time. Add that to the inequity created by exclusive zoning and here we are. I think we should expect some discomfort in making the necessary changes. I agree to considering the 2019 households baseline for comparison but I believe we must seek to correct for past poor performance in production. That all should have been planned and executed better. We are here now.
- **Fierce:** That's a great point, Rick. Big changes need to be made to undo 40 years of the status quo. Change can be uncomfortable and scary, but it's an opportunity for growth, and I don't just mean in population
- **Fierce:** I anticipate this leading to all kinds of "thinking outside the box" planning. Yeah it's gonna be a challenge, but this is Silicon Valley and the birthplace of the internet itself. We're a smart bunch of people here in the bay area.
- **Bonilla:** Regarding Urbanized areas: many suburban areas are now (and have been) urbanizing. It's happening holistically. The modern world is a place of change.
- **Brilliot:** Does it make sense to do a temp check on all the various requests?
- **Brown:** yes
- **Tawny Macedo:** Also, for urbanized areas per 65584.04 (d)(2)(B), COG's may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances or land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternate zoning ordinances and land use restrictions.
- **Fierce:** Cargo Bikes are super great, and there's electric options that are sometimes even faster than transit. Few people need to own one full-time, so there's lots of bike shops offering them for rent.
- **Fierce:** They're also what we need to save the planet; continuing to support Oil infrastructure dooms future generations, more so than we've already done.
- **Strellis:** Hi Michael and Monica - we are first attempting to clarify the requests to make they are actionable and can do modified consensus as is necessary
- **Pappas:** I think Julie Pierce's point is very valid the only point that I would add is that the high opportunity access and jobs housing fit would make the majority of Very low and low income RHNA based on non-transit factors
- **Levin:** Are we no longer taking people in order?
- **Brilliot:** I believe we are discussing an equity adjacent factor for both 5a and 6a not just 5a.
- **Strellis:** Hi Michael - that's correct. We are focusing on 5A first and will then discuss amendments to 6A



- **Strellis:** We are doing our best to track all of the suggested amendments/alternatives in an organized way! I know it may seem redundant but we don't want anything to fall through the cracks
- **Brilliot:** Ok,, think that could be one vote but could separate if you prefer.
- **Selander:** where was that in the packet?
- **Selander:** I thought I saw every page and never came across that
- **Kaplan:** mtc.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=cc14a2ac-8562-4918-a64e-e826993f61c2.pdf link to the table
- **Selander:** ohhhh end of extra handout
- **Aksel Olsen:** Nell: It was referred to as the handout on the agenda
- **Kaplan:** <http://mtc.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=cc14a2ac-8562-4918-a64e-e826993f61c2.pdf>
- **Selander:** got it
- **Selander:** i must be looking at an old agenda, there's no reference to handout
- **Brown:** I want that to be an additional 5A

Public Comment on Equity Adjustment for 5A

Darrell Owens: Emphasized that the housing needs to be closer to transit. Sprawl development would not allow transit expansion, especially in Solano County. It is contrary to our climate goals. HMC should be focusing on high resource areas closer to urban cores.

Shajuti Hossain, Public Advocates: Supported the Equity Adjustment proposal because it will help the Bay Area combat racial segregation.

Kelsey Banes, Peninsula for Everyone: Commented on transit proximity. Peninsula is job rich, but not as transit rich. Noticed that when transit proximity is ramped up, housing moves to Oakland and SF, with less housing along the Peninsula. If housing is near jobs, even if there is not a bus going to the Stanford Research Park, for instance, I can walk, bike, or drive a shorter distance. Many of my colleagues who live in the East Bay are already commuting. Providing more jobs in the proximal area would mean less driving. Transit seems to skew things towards just SF and Oakland.

Shipley: Clarifying question in the Zoom chat on the equity adjustment, "would adjusting those below 1.0 up, bring all those above it down, rendering all jurisdictions at 1.0?"

- **Levin:** We are not talking about reducing allocations for jurisdictions in green. We can look at cities that do not score high for exclusionary to see if adjustments can be made to offset increases.
- **Macedo:** If pulling from those above the proportionality, would it just make it proportional across the board? There is a finite number of units to move around.
- **Levin:** We have flagged 49 cities that rank high as exclusionary to see if they have proportional allocations of low and very low-income housing. It does not apply to other jurisdictions. It may be more appropriate to draw from non-exclusionary areas with higher proportions, rather than draw from the exclusionary districts.



Romero: The equity proposal would not create sprawl. It requires higher density to accommodate new units.

Dillon: This would not work for unincorporated Napa. Maybe it will work for other counties, but we have no sewer or water infrastructure.

Decision Point: Does the HMC recommend ABAG staff work on a methodology incorporating the equity proposal for 5A and 6A?

- **Shipleigh:** We must move to a decision point – do you want ABAG staff to work on data incorporating the equity proposal? The HMC decided to move forward 6A. Given the meeting's time limit and the number of, staff urged the group to move more quickly through the discussion.

Dillon: Urged the HMC to consider that Napa County lost 900 units over the past 4 years, some lost in the last two weeks. Napa will never be able to meet these numbers. Hazards must be considered as a factor. Regardless, this is not where we want housing to be built. This is the affordable part of the County. Would like to see 20 percent hazards factor in the methodology.

- **Pappas:** Question for people in the rural counties. Natural hazards factor is an allocation to an entire region. As planners, we want to avoid zoning in natural disaster areas. Emphasized sympathy to impacts and displacement of natural disaster. Why can't policy makers site zoning in places that are at less risk for those types of things? They can urbanize and densify.
- **Dillon:** There is no ability to add sewer and water capacity. LAFCO prevents us from hooking up to the city anymore without them annexing. This is for areas that are already in urbanized places.
- **Pappas:** In the areas that are already urbanized? Not adding land that is not unincorporated, but places within the existing footprint.
- **Dillon:** Yes, in the cities. But no, not in the unincorporated parts.
- **Pappas:** Okay, so the issue is with unincorporated parts of the County.
- **Dillon:** Yes.
- **Eklund:** Marin and Sonoma have many fire-prone areas, and Wildland/Urban Interface Zones. We should not be building in those vulnerable areas because they are going to burn, endangering firefighters. Sonoma is unique because all cities have urban growth boundaries that cannot be expanded. The City of Novato has a voter-adopted urban growth boundary and cannot annex any property outside of the current city boundary. Pushed committee to remove fire risk areas from urban and unincorporated areas. Supported 20 percent or greater weight for hazards factor.

Shipleigh: Moved the discussion towards a decision point.

Brilliot: A 20 percent fire factor will not change the methodology very much. Can HMC recommend to staff and ABAG Executive Board to revisit the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint to address this issue? It would involve pulling projected growth out of areas that are not planned for urban growth. This cannot be solved as part of the factors we are discussing. Can that be part of our final recommendation?



- **Vautin:** Draft Blueprint focuses all the growth within existing urbanized growth boundaries. Unincorporated growth is within the spheres of influence of the city. The question becomes, "do we assign the spheres of influence to the unincorporated county, where the land currently is, or to the city with the sphere of influence it is next to." Staff is open to looking at this on a county by county basis to consider what is most appropriate to align RHNA. We are looking at 2050 Households as the baseline. Some people today live in unincorporated areas, so there would be allocations and growth there.
- **Brilliot:** I think that is a mistake. We do not want to perpetuate sprawl by allocating RHNA numbers.

Walsh: What does the natural hazards factor apply to? Does it only impact urbanized areas in hazard areas, and not rural or unincorporated areas?

- **Adams:** Correct, it focuses on urbanized land area which is where cities plan for growth. Growth is more likely to happen there compared to the rural areas. Noted that using Plan Bay Area as part of the baseline would not put more growth in those areas as part of the plan. It has already been recommended to avoid growth in those high-risk areas.

Fierce: (Tech issues; could not ask question)

Arreguín: Suggested extending for another 15 minutes to 1:15. Invited anyone with input on 6A to comment now. Moved the group to a vote.

Shipley: Decision point on 20 percent Hazard option for 5A and 6A, understanding that other factors will be reduced.

Public Comment on Modification to Factors and Weights

Aaron Eckhouse: Natural hazards are a huge issue, but the proposed factor as is will not be effective. It needs to happen at the city level. It would increase housing growth in unincorporated Sonoma County. Jobs proximity is the best tool to effectively reduce sprawl, and act as an anti-hazard factor.

Darrel Owens: Agreed with Eckhouse. Urged HMC to focus on jobs rather than housing or transit. Concerned about the high number of units in unincorporated Solano. Banning zoning in high fire risk area is important but it is up to the State.

Decision Point: Does the HMC recommend a new methodology with 20 percent hazards factor added?

- **Shipley:** The decision point to add Hazards as a factor has been blocked. Before moving to 6A, noted that there was a proposal for 50 percent high opportunity, 25 percent job proximity-auto and 25 percent job proximity-transit. There was not opposition, so could this be a proposition for 6A?

Arreguín: As the President of the Board, this is something we need to take very seriously.

Shipley: For 6A, there are already two alternatives. Let's start with the 2019 baseline and the equity adjustment with a 30 percent job proximity- transit for low- and very low-income. To clarify, for the lower income brackets, jobs proximity would replace jobs housing fit.

- **Fierce:** Yes, that is correct.

Levin: Asked Fierce if they would be open to doing the same thing on 6A that was done with 5A to split auto proximity and transit proximity.

- **Fierce:** Yes.
- **Fligor:** Supported that compromise, too.
- **Shipley:** Confirmed percentages would be 15 percent job proximity – auto and 15 percent job proximity – transit.

Brown: If this option passes, we would be down to four choices - 5A, 6A as is, 5A1 and 6A1 that we are discussing?

- **Shipley:** There are four options for 5A: regular, 2019 baseline, equity adjustment, and 50 percent high opportunity areas, 25 percent job proximity – auto and 25 percent job proximity – transit. There are four options for 6A: regular 6A, 2019 baseline, equity adjustment and perhaps an option with 70 percent high opportunity areas, 15 percent job proximity – auto, and 15 percent job proximity – transit.
- **Arreguín:** Do you have an objection? Should we do a card vote?
- **Brown:** Yes, let's vote.

Public Comment on Proposal

Owens: Can you put up the appendix with the geographical breakdown? (Took a screenshot of the image)

Eckhouse: Voiced strong support for this modification.

Decision Point: Does the HMC recommend 6A modifications with 70 percent high opportunity areas, 15 percent job proximity – auto, and 15 percent job proximity-transit

- **Shipley:** Consensus reached; this option will move forward to the next meeting.

Selander: Could staff send a list of the options with percent options to play with in the tool sooner rather than later? Could there be a separate allocation process for unincorporated areas to treat them differently? Suggested to add metric to check proportionality and growth in fire hazard zones.

- **Shipley:** Sometime next week, we will try to get that information out. It feels late to add a metric proposal.
- **Levin:** Concerned about this metric because it measures if there are jurisdictions that are fire prone. The decision to put housing there or not is not an allocation issue.
- **Selander:** Agreed.

Shipley: One proposal for 6A is incorporating urbanized land area factor. Is there a percentage proposal? Asked Eklund if this is a proposal they would like to make more formally.



- **Eklund:** Does Plan Bay Area only look at buildable area? If not, there should be a factor to exclude areas that are not buildable (parks, agricultural land, etc.)
- **Shipley:** Is this a factor proposal for discussion? If not, any other options for 6A people want to bring to the next and final HMC meeting?

Shipley: Congratulations to everyone for hard work.

Zoom Comments Prior to Adjournment

- **Macedo:** Clarifying question: For the equity adjustment, would adjusting those below 1.0 up, bring all those above down to 1.0, rendering all jurisdictions at 1.0?
- **Macedo:** That's helpful to note that it's not all jurisdictions. I'd note that 1.0 is the floor of not going backwards on equity, a ratio above 1.0 would more so demonstrate furthering equity.
- **Brown:** YES, Solano same issue
- **Brown:** drive 1-80 east see the blacken hills. Fires jumped 1-80 and almost took out homes in the city of fairfield
- **Riley:** SB 182 passed re wildfire and housing,
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB182
- **Littlehale:** Time check? Are we going to extend?
- **Littlehale:** If so ... fair warning?
- **Brown:** can we do a check
- **Riley:** I have to get off at 1:00.
- **Strellis:** Jane, if you would like to put any comments on 6A in the chat (or anything else) we will track it
- b Great, thank you. Support adding equity factor to both Options. Support jobs proximity. Thanks!
- **Fligor:** Can we apply the same proposed modifications to 5A to 6A?
- **Brown:** let's vote on 6A
- **Brown:** so that would mean another 6A
- **Fligor:** Yes
- **Brown:** VOTE
- **Fligor:** I have to drop. Thank you.
- **Brown:** Monday is a holiday
- **Brown:** I have flooding in my district every year.
- **Marti:** My apologies, I have to leave, as I am presenting on a panel at 1pm. Thank you for all your work.
- **Littlehale:** As we prepare to adjourn: Happy Labor Day! Reflect on & celebrate the contributions of organized working people to a more decent, dignified society.
- **Strellis:** Thanks Fernando - again, anyone who would like to leave comments on 6A in the chat, we will track them
- **Brown:** Please wear masks, 6 feet apart, stay safe
- **Selander:** Thanks for the reminder Monica!
- **Macedo:** I'll put this in the chat again since my mic didn't seem to be working earlier: Also, for urbanized areas per 65584.04 (d)(2)(B), COG's may not limit its consideration of



suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances or land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternate zoning ordinances and land use restrictions.

- **Fierce:** Prop 15 bike and car caravan rally in Oakland this Monday, for those looking to celebrate the occasion responsibly.
- **Brown:** BE SAFE STAY STRONG

6. Adjournment/ Next Meeting

Sep 18 – Final Option

