



City Council

Susan Candell, Mayor
Teresa Gerringer, Vice Mayor
Carl Anduri, Council Member
Gina Dawson, Council Member
Wei-Tai Kwok, Council Member

October 15, 2021

Jesse Arreguin, President
Members of the ABAG Executive Board
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105-2006

SUBJECT: Objection to the use of errata to change policy

President Arreguin and Member of the Board,

Over more than a year, the City of Lafayette has been actively engaged in the RHNA process, providing feedback at key milestones during the time that the Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) met, providing written comment letters to ABAG leadership, and requesting one-on-one office hours with key staff at ABAG.

Our appeal of our draft allocation was submitted in a timely fashion, and we provided clear documentation that Plan Bay Area 2050, which provided housing growth projections that were subsequently used as the baseline for the RHNA allocation process, failed to exclude public lands located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones from its Growth Geographies, thereby increasing the number of units allocated to Lafayette in error.

The Draft RHNA Allocation Plan adopted by the Executive Board notes, on page 36, that: "The Final Blueprint Growth Geographies exclude CalFire designated VHFHSZs and county designated WUIs" and "The Final Blueprint Strategies focus future growth away from the highest fire risk zones." The January 21, 2021 Executive Board meeting transcript reads in part: "...[w]hen we're trying to accommodate 1.5 million homes across the region it's hard to take everything off the table. We've taken off the table large parts of the region that are not growth geographies. We're protecting public buildings, protecting public parks and open spaces. All those things are protected. We took off the table high risk fire areas and the like and any sort of areas that wouldn't be protected from sea level rise." [emphasis added]

ABAG's response to our appeal states: "Throughout the region, it is essentially impossible to avoid all hazards when siting new development, but jurisdictions can think critically about which areas in the community have the *highest* hazard risk."

We agree, and it is clear that ABAG did precisely this at a regional scale, excluding high fire hazards zones from Growth Geographies. It is clear that an error was made when public lands which lie within VHFHSZs were included in the RHNA calculations, which staff acknowledges. All of the information available to the public and Executive Board stated that Growth Geographies excluded VHFHSZ's and that Public Lands were within Growth Geographies. However, the week of our appeal hearing, ABAG issued an erratum in an attempt to correct it at the last minute. In our view, it is inappropriate to use an erratum to change a policy that had been clearly stated throughout Plan Bay Area 2050 documentation, and it is inconsistent with the information provided to the public and the Executive Board before it voted on May 20th. The definition of erratum is an error in writing or printing, not a change in policy.

Next Steps

1. We understand that the Administrative Committee took a preliminary action to deny Lafayette's appeal, however we respectfully request that the error be corrected by reducing our allocation when the final action is taken.
2. The issuance of an errata (see attached) should not be used to change policy moving forward and should be limited to factual and technical corrections. Policy changes should be made by the Executive Board through a public hearing process.

Sincerely,



Susan Candell, Mayor

On Behalf of the Lafayette City Council

Cc: Therese Watkins McMillan, Executive Director, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gillian Adams, Principal Planner, ABAG Regional Planning Program
Dave Vautin, Plan Bay Area 2050
Members of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Enc. Draft Plan Bay Area 2050 Errata • Updated September 13, 2021

Draft Plan Bay Area 2050 Errata

Updated September 13, 2021

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments note the following errors in the Draft Plan Bay Area 2050 document and supplemental reports. This document is regularly updated on the Plan Bay Area 2050 website.

Document	Page Number	Paragraph or Table Number	Correction
Draft Plan and Supplemental Reports	Various	N/A	Add Rohnert Park Councilmember Susan Adams to the list of ABAG Executive Board City Representatives and remove the vacant Cities in Sonoma County board seat
Forecasting and Modeling Report	41	Table 11	Change “2 BART routes” to “3 BART routes”
	53	Paragraph 2	In order to make the description consistent with the MTC/ABAG actions taken in September 2020 and January 2021, delete “were within the Growth Geographies and”
Statutorily Required Plan Maps	19	N/A	The following Priority Conservation Areas were omitted from the map of Alameda County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arroyo Las Positas Trail • First Street
	20	N/A	The following Priority Conservation Area was omitted from the map of Contra Costa County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northwest Waterfront
	21	N/A	The following Priority Conservation Area was omitted from the map of Marin County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiburon Open Space
	22	N/A	The following Priority Conservation Area was omitted from the map of Napa County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Napa County Agricultural Lands and Watersheds

	23	N/A	<p>The following Priority Conservation Areas were omitted from the map of San Francisco County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Waterfront • Excelsior/OMI Park Connections • India Basin • Lake Merced/Ocean Beach • Northern Waterfront • Treasure Island
	25	N/A	<p>The following Priority Conservation Areas were omitted from the map of Santa Clara County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palo Alto Baylands • Palo Alto Foothills
	26	N/A	<p>The following Priority Conservation Areas were omitted from the map of Solano County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cache Slough • Dixon Agricultural Service Area • Mare Island Open Space • Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area • White Slough Wetlands Area
	27	N/A	<p>The following Priority Conservation Area was omitted from the map of Sonoma County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southeast Greenway
Technical Assumptions Report	2	Paragraph 1	Change “\$466 billion” to “\$469 billion”
	3	Paragraph 1	Change “\$113 billion” to “\$110 billion”
	15	Table 7	Combine “FHWA STP/CMAQ - Regional” and “FHWA STP/CMAQ - County” into one row, titled “FHWA STBG/CMAQ”
Transportation Project List	4	N/A	Delete “and Clayton Rd” from the scope of RTP ID 21-T06-033
	5	N/A	Move “(i.e., highway or freeway lane, auxiliary lane, or HOV lane)” to follow “lane extensions of less than 1/4-mile” in scope of RTP ID 21-T06-048
	6	N/A	Delete “(less than 1/4-mile)” from scope of RTP ID 21-T07-056
	12	N/A	Make the following changes to the scope of RTP ID 21-T12-116: change “I-80 (ALA)” to

			“I-80 (ALA, CC) and SR-4 (CC)” and “I-680 (ALA)” to “I-680 (ALA, CC)”
	12	N/A	Change “Service Expansion” to “Modernization” in the title of RTP ID 21-T12-124