



# MEMO

To: RHNA HMC Team  
From: Civic Edge Consulting  
Date: September 29, 2020  
RE: September 18, 2020 HMC Meeting #12 Notes



## Meeting Info

Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) Meeting #12  
Friday, September 18, 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)

**Josh Abrams:** Former HMC member who left because of a potential conflict of interest with a consulting project. Suggested capping the allocations for the lowest income cities in the region because they are already struggling with high segregation and concentrated poverty. Given the history of legally supported segregation and gentrification, giving them low income allocations concentrates poverty further, and giving them high income allocation risks displacement. If these cities want to grow, they can create a thoughtful planning process that supports residents.

Some of the most segregated cities are expected to grow almost 12 percent and noted concerns about that causing displacement. Suggested capping RHNA to 4 percent over eight years to reduce outside growth pressure. This will not impact other RHNA allocations, because this would only apply to a few cities. The California Opportunity Map that HMC is already using would be the best to identify these cities.

### 3. Chair's Report – Jesse Arreguín (Approval)

**Jesse Arreguín:** Announced meeting logistics and the goal of arriving at a final recommendation of proposed RHNA methodology for MTC/ABAG staff and the ABAG Regional Planning Committee and Executive Board. Reminded that ABAG is required to allocate all 441,176 units given to the Bay Area by the State HCD in a way that meets all requirements. Noted that today's recommendation is the first major step in the RHNA process. MTC/ABAG

staff will then make a recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee and Executive Board based on HMC's input. After the Executive Board approves the methodology, local governments, stakeholders and the public will have an opportunity to comment.

Noted that many jurisdictions are concerned about their high RHNA allocations, and that ABAG will be providing some grants to help implement the changes to adjust zoning and housing elements. Re-iterated that it is a collaborative process between ABAG and local governments.

Looked back on this process to highlight how it brought diverse voices together to decide allocations for the entire region. Expressed appreciation for everyone's time and energy and noted that a thank you note and small gift will be arriving in the mail for all members.

Stated that today's Meeting Packet involves notes from last meeting, correspondence from HMC Members and the PowerPoint presentation.

#### **HMC Discussion and Public Comment on Chair's Report**

N/A

#### **4. Consent Calendar - Approval of ABAG Housing Methodology Committee Minutes of September 4, 2020 (Approval)**

**Jane Riley:** Motion to approve minutes from September 4 meeting.

**Rick Bonilla:** Seconded motion to approve.

#### **HMC Member Discussion and Public Comment on Consent Calendar**

N/A

**Arreguín:** Asked for roll call vote on motion.

Motion passed with one abstention.

#### **5. Regional Housing Needs Allocation – Recommending a Proposed RHNA Methodology-Presentation by Gillian Adams (Approval)**

**Arreguín:** Stated that HMC will first come to a decision on the Proposed Equity Adjustment (Slide 9) and then move toward conversation around methodology options.

#### **Public Comment on Proposed Equity Adjustment**

**Shajuti Hossain, Public Advocates:** Expressed support for the Equity Adjustment because some jurisdictions are not receiving a proportional share of low-income and very low-income housing even though some of them have a high jobs-housing fit ratio, like Daly City, Livermore, and Pleasant Hill. These cities need more affordable homes for balancing out the ratio, which 6A alone does not meet.



**Fred Castro:** Public Comments submitted in writing on the methodology were sent to HMC members.

## HMC Discussion on Proposed Equity Adjustment

**Arreguín:** Invited HMC members who wrote the Equity Adjustment to offer comments before it goes to a decision point.

**Martí:** Re-iterated that Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing is important for the group. Reasoned that in fairness, it made sense that jurisdictions should at least reach a proportionality in their low- and very low-income housing allocations.

**Arreguín:** Reminded HMC members to get decision point cards ready for after the discussion.

**Darin Ranelletti:** Asked staff to re-explain how the re-allocation would work for exclusionary jurisdictions that do not meet proportionality. Also, why would places like Mountain View or Walnut Creek have a reduced number of lower income units under this scenario?

- **Aksel Olsen:** Appendix 5 shows the 49 cities identified by the HMC-proposed composite score, and the cities colored in red are in deficit and not meeting proportionality for their lower-income allocations. For cities that did not meet proportionality, there was a “light-touch adjustment” to see what unit count would bring them up to 100 percent proportional. The units would come out of cities like Mountain View because they were not on the list of the 49 cities identified by the HMC-proposed composite score identifying exclusionary jurisdictions. So the 60 cities not on the list represented the pool of units to move, and some units were moved from those cities to those on the list of 49 with lower-income unit deficits. Although some of the cities may seem counterintuitive, that is the mechanics behind shuffling the units around to achieve proportionality for the cities identified as exclusionary using the HMC-proposed composite score.
- **Ranelletti:** Asked for clarification on the definition of proportionality. Wanted to confirm that proportionality is the jurisdiction’s share of the region’s very low- and low-income RHNA compared to the jurisdiction’s current share of the region’s households.
- **Olsen:** Correct. For example, if a jurisdiction’s share of very low- and low-income units is two percent, but its share of the region’s households is three percent then it is below proportionality.

**Arreguín:** Asked for any other discussion for the proposed equity adjustment.

**Carlos Romero:** Understood the concern that the equity adjustment may overcomplicate the RHNA narrative, but it helps the group to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing. Noted that it seems to get all nine counties to a more equitable distribution, particularly among low-income units. Expressed overall support for the equity adjustment.

**Rodney Nickens, Jr:** Expressed support for the equity adjustment. Recognized that no methodology approach will be perfect, so this adjustment would help any of the methodologies reach goals of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. Echoed Hossain’s comments that it is a critical piece to moving us toward our policy goals.



**Arreguín:** Asked for final thoughts on the equity adjustment and expressed own opinion on it. Thanked HMC members who developed the proposal. Noted that HMC is eager to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing to meet statutory objectives and to address racial and economic segregation in the region. Stated that many of the methodologies would get the region to that goal. As a local elected official who will need to implement it, noted concerns about the additional layer of complexity and explanation. The impact of the proposal would be marginal and stated that they will not be supporting it. Clarified that the same goals can be met with the other methodology options.

**Forrest Ebbs:** Noted a desire to maintain transparency in the RHNA process. Encouraged everyone to be aware of explaining it to jurisdictions and neighboring cities. Stated that if it is hard to understand, it may lose credibility. They do not support the equity adjustment proposal because it only has marginal impacts, and some people are already confused by the process.

**Jeffrey Levin:** Noted that the adjustment was proposed because many jurisdictions would be moving backwards in terms of racial and economic equity without it. Addressed some objections in the staff report that the cities that would get adjustments are not necessarily high job centers. However, many of the cities still have significant jobs-housing fit issues. They have a much higher amount of low wage jobs than they do affordable housing. Therefore, adding lower-income allocations for those cities would ensure fewer commuters. Although the adjustment may not have a huge regional impact, it will impact the local dynamics and access to opportunities. Noted that the adjustment would not be difficult to explain for the RHNA narrative.

**Julie Pierce:** Clarifying question about what the group is about to come to a decision on.

- **Arreguín:** We are coming to a decision on whether to use the equity adjustment in the methodology or not. Reminded the group to get red and green voting cards ready.

**Temperature Check: does the HMC recommend adopting the equity adjustment proposal?**

- 9 red cards. The decision was blocked and will not be discussed further.

### **Public Comment on Proposed Methodology Options**

**Arreguín:** Opened Public Comment for any of the methodology options.

**John Swiecki,** Community Development Director for City of Brisbane: Noted that Plan Bay Area 2050 as a benchmark is an unreasonably high starting point for the City of Brisbane. It does not represent a middle ground between 2019 households and future expected growth. The proposed methodology options result in an allocation of 2,700 to 2,900 units in one RHNA cycle, which is a more than 100 percent increase in households over eight years. Stated that no other jurisdiction has this type of "onerous" obligation. Their last RHNA cycle allocation was 83 units, but they have amended their general plan to add 2,000 units and feel they have done their fair share. Urged committee to choose a reasonable and fair methodology.



**Shajuti Hossain**, Public Advocates: Expressed support for 6A as the best option to combat racial and economic segregation in the region. Thanked HMC for prioritizing equity throughout the RHNA process.

**Aaron Eckhouse**, California YIMBY: Thanked HMC members for identifying key factors. Expressed support for either 6A or 8A because they advance access to opportunity, Affirmatively Further Fair Housing, and place housing near jobs in areas that would help the region meet climate goals.

**Zarina Kiziloglu**: Expressed support for Plan Bay Area 2050 baseline with option 6A. Urged HMC to select this option because it addresses jobs-housing fit, and combats discrimination and segregation. Encouraged HMC to vote for Option 6A to affirmatively further fair housing.

**Justine Marcus**, State and Local Policy Director at Enterprise Community Partners: Expressed support for Option 6A as the best option to balance the diverse objectives of RHNA, and forward racial and social equity. Supported the future year 2050 households baseline because it also reflects the compromise and work of the HMC.

**Kelsey Banes**, Peninsula for Everyone: Noted they are from an organization that does advocacy for more housing at all income levels. Noticed growth in their area where it makes sense to have growth, in a way that furthers regional equity. Stressed that finding housing in San Mateo County is nearly impossible at low- and very low- income levels. The housing shortage is dire, and the big jumps make sense, particularly in the smaller districts in San Mateo. Noted excitement about implementation.

**Arreguín**: Reminded group that this is the time for Public Comment on all methodologies.

**Castro**: There are no more raised hands, and comments that were submitted have been sent to HMC members.

### **HMC Discussion on Methodology Options**

**Arreguín**: Opened a conversation on the methodology options.

**Monica Brown**: Questioned if the HMC was using the 2019 households or 2050 households baseline. Noted that unincorporated areas could technically be within a city's sphere of influence. Concerned that those areas still do not have infrastructure or water. Noted that in Solano County, the 2019 household baseline would require less growth, and the 2050 households baseline would triple the growth. Concerned that growth is not kept in city limits.

- **Arreguín**: The group decided in late August to use 2050 future households as the baseline. The HMC reached consensus on this decision.
- **Gillian Adams**: Agreed with Chair Arreguín's summary. Committee decided to move forward with the 2050 households baseline. We have heard the pros and cons of using Plan Bay Area as part of the methodology. It is up to committee members if they would



like to re-visit it. But we do have a decision in place to move forward with the 2050 households baseline.

- **Brown:** What was the rationale for looking at both baselines for today's meeting?
- **Arreguín:** It was a data request from Jane Riley to see analysis on both baselines.
- **Jane Riley:** Yes, Sonoma County and unincorporated areas do better under 2019 households baseline. Stated that they requested to see both sets of data. After reviewing, for the Bay Area as a whole, felt 2019 households baseline was not the best way to go.

**Jeffrey Levin:** After reviewing data, supported Option 6A. Noted that some people want RHNA to focus on areas of jobs and job growth. Others have pushed to address Affirmatively Further Fair Housing, and fair shares to all jurisdictions. 6A balances these concerns.

Stressed that jobs as a factor has been thoughtfully included. Noted that the presence of jobs makes an area high opportunity, so that factor is still indirectly accounted for. Since HMC is using 2050 households as the baseline, that also incorporates job growth. Pushed back on some HMC members' concerns that the methodology does not adequately place housing where jobs are. Emphasized that the methodology gives a lot of weight to the location of jobs, but does so in a way that better balances the housing distribution around the Bay Area.

Highlighted that the Bay Area's overall growth is jumping from 188,000 to 441,000. Since everyone is getting a huge increase, it does not make sense for jurisdictions to argue that they are taking on much more than last round. The entire region is taking on over twice the number from last round. This larger number considers growth and housing to accommodate that growth, and it also accounts for the failure of the region to meet housing needs in the past. Option 6A balances many issues, particularly with the compromise of the 2050 households baseline. The HMC is trying to address existing housing problems, accommodate growth, and deal with the jobs and transportation nexus while also dealing with equity and fair housing. Reiterated support for Option 6A because this methodology option strikes a balance between all of these concerns.

**Riley:** Re-iterated that everyone will take on a huge increase of about 135 percent from last cycle's Regional Housing Need Determination. Noted that they do housing work all over the state and thinks 135 percent is reasonable, especially compared to increases in Southern California.

Under Option 6A, in unincorporated areas in Napa, Sonoma and Marin the increase is not 135 percent, which they would be comfortable with. The increase in these unincorporated counties is 417 percent to 2,000 percent from last cycle's RHNA. There are cities on BART with a lot of employment seeing increases as low as 18 percent, indicating something is "amiss" with the methodology. Unincorporated areas cannot take on a higher percentage than cities because it creates sprawl and runs counter to vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and climate goals.

Unincorporated communities would never be able to get a certified housing element because it would be a struggle for jurisdictions to find adequate sites for housing. There is no



infrastructure, and not enough land that would be approved by HCD that can be zoned for housing. Without a certified housing element, there is no money for housing.

Noted that some areas that Plan Bay Area 2050 assumes will be slated for high-density housing are environmentally unwanted – alongside freeways, near industry, in flood zones. Currently, poor people live there because of the low land cost. There is an equity issue with the land use patterns, and we do not want to perpetuate it.

- **Dave Vautin:** Explained that unincorporated areas are seeing this trend in RHNA because there are two key differences between RHNA Cycle 5 and RHNA Cycle 6. First, the baseline for RHNA cycle 5 was the long-range plan's growth, not the future year households. The previous Plan Bay Area, as well as this one, had little growth in unincorporated areas, so in the previous cycle these areas had small RHNA numbers as well. However, there are existing households in unincorporated areas today. 2050 households is the sum of current households and that future growth, so the baseline RHNA for these unincorporated areas is higher due to the use of 2050 households as the baseline instead of the plan's future growth.

Next, is the sphere of influence. Last cycle, many counties agreed to assign the sphere of influence growth allocations to respective cities. There was a consensus reached early in the process last cycle. Cities took on shares of RHNA for areas they might annex in the future.

Currently, ABAG is in conversation with several counties, including Sonoma, who are interested in doing that again this cycle. ABAG is also in continued conversation with HCD on a case by case basis to shift the balance between counties and cities.

- **Riley:** Understood that the methodology has changed and appreciated the clarification, but stated the allocations to unincorporated areas were still disproportionate. Reiterated that when staff is looking into planning for housing on a more zoomed in level that affordable housing should not be in areas near freeways or floodplains.

**Ranelletti:** Supported Option 6A and amplified Levin's comments that the methodology sufficiently incorporates jobs and transit. Given the national recognition around racial injustice, this shows that as a region, we are serious about accelerating housing justice now since the inequities in society are all driven by housing inequities. Emphasized that jobs and transit are not ignored in the methodology, and that equity is a priority that needs to happen sooner rather than later.

**Pat Eklund:** Stated frustration that the HMC blocked a discussion about future household growth as a baseline allocation even though it was used last cycle. Noted they planned to raise this to the ABAG Executive Board. Supports Option 7A because if high opportunity areas are included, they should be balanced with proximity to jobs.

Echoed Riley's sentiment that with such a large RHNA allocation, it will be difficult to simply find land suitable to zone for building.



Urged HMC members to not support Option 6A, and instead support Option 7A because it is more balanced and fairer.

**Diane Dillon:** Asked if HMC should be using the RHNA online visualization tool or the Appendix 4 spreadsheet to see projections. Noted that the outcomes are very different.

- **Adams:** Look at the spreadsheet instead of the tool. There are some discrepancies, and a revised version was sent out with correct numbers.

**Dillon:** Echoed Riley's statements about gratitude to staff, and highlighted differences in rural counties. Problems with the definition of "urbanized land." Appreciated the passion and collaboration with housing advocates and wanted to see that type of collaboration in Board rooms for zoning and approvals. Napa County is an agricultural community that taxes itself to fund housing. Noted spending a lot of money "fighting NIMBY's" because they do not want to pave over agricultural land.

Highlighted that climate action is the most urgent problem to address. Urged HMC to support Option 7A for its inclusion of proximity to transit. Housing injustice can be addressed through other avenues, but we must move housing near transit to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Neysa Fligor:** Echoed gratitude to staff. Supported Option 8A because it does well under Objective 2. Noted that addressing climate change should be a big component, especially given all the fires in the Bay Area right now. Stated that Option 8A does not perform poorly on other objectives – it performs "okay or well" across the board, compared to Option 7A, which performs poorly on some metrics. Claimed that Option 8A has a fairer housing allocation across the region and meets most of the objectives and goals.

Understood proponents of Option 6A and noted that Option 8A also addresses equity and racial injustice.

**Victoria Fierce:** Agreed with other comments that the 2019 households baseline may be better at putting less housing in unincorporated areas, but understood that option may no longer be on the table. Stated they were happy to stick with the 2050 households baseline since the process is so far along already.

Noted that Option 6A and Option 8A were similar, and both very good options. Supported Option 8A more strongly. Even though it does not perform as good as Option 6A on equity, but greenhouse gas emissions should be the top priority right now. With more wildfires and less breathable air, all the equity plans would not matter because the area would be unlivable. Urged HMC members to consider the marginal benefit of Option 8A, but would also support Option 6A.

**Romero:** Echoed Levin and Ranelletti's statements of support for Option 6A.

Noted that the methodology should address housing injustices that have been historically present. The best way to do so is through low- and very low-income housing allocations



through Option 6A. Explained a few of the compromises the group has made and urged HMC to support Option 6A because it meets more goals and performs better.

Stated that HMC should move forward with the 2050 households baseline as discussed, and not bring back the 2019 households baseline.

**Ebbs:** Noted that in general, all options are “revolutionary.” Emphasized that the delineation between jurisdiction lines, and unincorporated areas versus city limit is policy, and is therefore not static. Even though change would require a culture shift, encouraged group not to look at current boundaries as constraints to work around. Explained that the City of Antioch has grown by incorporating previously unincorporated areas.

Noted that State Law does not exempt unincorporated areas from participating – there is nothing that precludes a county from engaging in urban development there. Understood that some cities have not traditionally participated in urbanizing unincorporated areas.

Noted that all methodology options will require radical shift in policy, especially in places that have not produced housing or jobs. Strong support for Options 6A and 8A, and some support for Options 5A and 7A.

**Pierce:** Stated that the process continues to be a monumental lift for complicated issues and perspectives. Noted that no options seem to be a good fit for Plan Bay Area 2050 since it would be nearly impossible to meet VMT and greenhouse gas targets set by the State. Technically, we can have RHNA separate, but we decide to align with Plan Bay Area 2050, which is the right move.

The group is up to about 20 different options with all the variations. Only Option 1 and Option 4 address jobs-housing balance. Of the options today, only Option 7 is somewhat consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050.

Noted that ABAG had a recent discussion about the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint and staff estimated a cost of over \$1.4 trillion from a wide variety of sources to reach Plan Bay Area 2050 goals. We need to lift low resource areas by adding resources such as access to opportunity and education, even if they are on the fringes of Bay Area.

Particularly, for the unincorporated areas that have traditionally not developed, HMC needs to acknowledge that not all counties are alike. In some cases, it is easier to annex unincorporated land and urbanize them, but in other cases, like in Sonoma County, it would be problematic.

Highlighted the recent fires and noted that many places have high hazards that need to be addressed.

Noted that RHNA should most heavily prioritize proximity to jobs from auto and transit. The quality of life for workers with long commutes impacts family and community life. Options 1 and 4 are best at limiting sprawl, meeting greenhouse gas targets, and lowering VMT.



**Mindy Gentry:** Noted concern for options because they do not sufficiently weigh jobs-housing balance and encourage sprawl. It places units disproportionately in urban and suburban areas which will increase congestion, or in areas that lack infrastructure that will not result in increased housing supply.

Stated that the plan will not allow us to reach our greenhouse gas reduction mandates. We need to encourage smart growth by placing housing where the jobs are. Stated a desire for a methodology that emphasized access to high resource areas, and a stronger jobs-housing fit.

**Scott Littlehale:** Supported 2050 households baseline that HMC came to a consensus on. The top 25 most populated jurisdictions have about 70 percent of the total RHNA allocation, so there is already significant concentration.

Highlighted a project on a brownfield site in the North Bay that involved 900 units. The total allocation for the unincorporated area today is under 900 units. There are appropriate sites for housing development in some unincorporated areas.

Expressed feeling “torn” between supporting Option 6A and Option 8A because jobs proximity is important for workers, as is equitable distribution. Noticed a concentrated increase in Option 8A for low- and very low-income units, particularly in San Francisco and Oakland. Noted that these two cities have voter-approved funding measures to support subsidized affordable housing. Option 8A shifts some of the burden of funding and zoning and has a very concentrated impact.

**Rick Bonilla:** Supported 2050 households baseline and Option 6A. Noted that San Mateo has a severe housing shortage and suffers from high greenhouse emissions as a result of freeways. After reviewing the data and maps, noted that the allocations seemed to be distributed fairly.

Echoed sentiment from Ebbs that urbanizing unincorporated areas is an argument with State policy and sees an opportunity for the unincorporated areas.

**Tawny Macedo:** Expressed deep appreciation for staff and HMC’s hard work in the process so far. Commended the group for landing on a few methodologies that acknowledge the importance of high opportunity areas and jobs-housing fit that address historical housing inequities. Noted the delicate balance between prioritizing equity and climate change.

Emphasized gratitude that the Bay Area is showing leadership and committing to racial justice through this process.

**Ellen Clark:** Thanked ABAG staff. Echoed Pierce’s concerns about balancing the methodology with Plan Bay Area environmental goals. Equity and Fair Housing objectives are built into the methodology throughout the process and weights. Noted that no options are perfect.

Flagged that since RHNA will result in re-zoning some cities, and Plan Bay Area is a long-range planning document, the trends may run counter to Plan Bay Area objectives.



Supported Option 4 that was set aside at a past meeting. Of the options today, stated that Option 7A comes the closest.

**Nickens, Jr:** Thanked colleagues for participation on a robust discussion. Supported Option 6A because without the equity adjustment, it is the best one to achieve statutory objectives and other goals. Noted that we are at an important moment for nation, that demands we face our region's legacy of historical racial injustice. Urged the group to take bold, proactive action with Option 6A to ensure everyone in the region – from essential workers to low-income families of color – have access to high opportunity areas in safe and affordable homes. Echoed statements from housing justice colleagues like Levin, Martí, and Romero and urged HMC to support Option 6A.

**James Pappas:** Thanked ABAG Staff and HMC colleagues. Noted that the numbers are politically and technically intimidating but was excited about moving towards an equitable approach. Noted empathy for those pushing for GHG and VMT reduction goals of Plan Bay Area, but emphasized that the options do concentrate growth, with more than 70 percent of growth in top 25 most populous cities.

Stated that they felt confident that using the 2050 households baseline is moving in the right direction for both equity and GHG reduction goals. There will be some jobs and housing in the more spread out parts of the region, and these places can grow in a more efficient way that reduces VMT. Expressed confidence in staff's recommendation and how it pursues both equity and GHG reduction goals.

Offered a hybrid of Option 6A and Option 8A with 15 percent jobs proximity to transit, and 15 percent jobs-housing fit, but expressed support for Option 6A and its equity-focused outcomes.

**Elise Semonian:** Thought no options adequately allocated to communities that have zoned for commercial instead of residential. Expressed opposition to the baseline because it does not place enough emphasis on jurisdictions that are creating thousands of jobs without addressing the housing demands they create. This is raising housing prices all over the Bay Area, contributing to exclusionary areas and environmental impacts from long commutes.

The smaller, high resource areas will be developed for housing if required, but the lots are small, expensive, and already mostly developed.

There should be a different baseline, or it should include a floor of housing units for the jurisdictions that are creating more jobs than housing.

Thanked staff for their continued hard work in the process.

**Susan Adams:** Echoed gratitude for staff. Appreciated Riley and Pierce's statements about Sonoma County. Re-iterated that to meet the numbers, Sonoma County would "need to have a tenth city." Stated apprehension in explaining the 1000 percent increase in RHNA numbers to councils and mayors. Agreed that it is a discussion for State policy, but also stated that Sonoma



County strongly opposes the options that make it near impossible for an approved housing element.

**Nell Selander:** Echoed gratitude to ABAG staff and HMC members. Emphasized that the decision is a compromise, and not a perfect fit. Appreciated Fierce's comments on Option 8A. Supported Option 8A because it gets at what opportunity is about. Proximity is what provides access to higher opportunity, and Option 8A allows low-income households to be more proximate to areas of opportunity.

### **Zoom Comments Before Break**

**Riley:** Thank you staff for all of the great data!!

**Bob Planthold:** Red.

**Alia Al-Sharif:** We counted your red. Thank you Bob.

**Matt Walsh:** Well said Jane! I agree completely.

**Fierce:** My hand's been raised but my zoom must be bugging out because I'm not seeing anyone else's. Is my hand actually still raised on staff's end?

**Paisley Strellis:** Yes, your hand is up Victoria

**Eli Kaplan:** Here is the corrected spreadsheet that Gillian referred to:

<https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=AO&ID=93000&GUID=49cb98f6-47f6-4c71-901e-ceb77a43a6bd&N=SXRlbSA1YSBIYW5kb3V0IEFwcGVuZGI4IDQgRGF0YSBUYWJsZSBBDT1JSRUNURUQgSEVBREVSUw%3d%3d>

**Riley:** In Sonoma County, each and every city has a voter-approved 30-year urban growth boundary.

**Brown:** In Solano we like to grow food. Also, water is an issue.

**Riley:** Speaking for unincorporated counties: HCD will not accept housing sites that do not have urban services, or can get them in time to develop higher-density housing within the 8 year housing period. So no sewer/water and no way to get it = unable to meet our RHNA obligations.

**Riley:** Thank you Julie. SO well said.

**Walsh:** Does Staff's recommendation of 6A apply to updated spreadsheets, or does it change with the updated spreadsheet? Can staff clarify?

**Kaplan:** The recommendation of 6A still applies to the updated spreadsheet.

**Brown:** Thanks to everyone. Stay Safe, Stay Strong

**Kaplan:** Here is the link to the updated spreadsheet again in case it is helpful for folks to review:

<https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=AO&ID=93000&GUID=49cb98f6-47f6-4c71-901e-ceb77a43a6bd&N=SXRlbSA1YSBIYW5kb3V0IEFwcGVuZGI4IDQgRGF0YSBUYWJsZSBBDT1JSRUNURUQgSEVBREVSUw%3d%3d>

### **[ 15-minute Break ]**

**Arreguín:** Re-opened discussion on the methodology options, particularly from any HMC members who have not spoken yet.



Recommended doing “straw polls” to gauge temperature, but not a formal, binding decision. Noted there was support for a few options, and concerns about adequately addressing goals and objectives. From discussion, recommended narrowed poll options to 6A, 7A and 8A to gauge support. Then, the group can move towards more discussion, or a motion.

Reminded HMC to only use red and green to be options, not yellow.

**Romero:** Clarifying question about options from discussion. Were two of the options tied in their verbal support?

- **Arreguín:** Yes, 6A and 7A seemed to be tied.

**Arreguín:** Reminded HMC members that this is not a binding consensus decision, and it will not effectively eliminate options.

#### **Straw Poll for Option 6A**

- 16 red and 12 green

#### **Straw Poll for Option 7A**

- 16 red and 10 green

#### **Straw Poll for Option 8A**

- 14 red and 18 green

**Arreguín:** Noted hearing some HMC concerns that none of these options adequately addressed greenhouse gas emission reduction and growth. Reminded the group that regardless of what majority decision is, HMC can submit a minority letter of concerns too. Given the strong support for Option 8A, it seems appropriate to make a motion to recommend it.

**Pierce:** Can we send a second option and gauge support level for Option 4A? It is a good alternative to meet the Plan Bay Area goals.

- **Susan Adams:** Seconds that secondary option.
- **Arreguín:** There is clearly a difference of opinion, so it would be appropriate to take a straw poll on Option 4A.

**Eklund:** If we are voting on Option 4A, can staff please put it in the screen to refresh everyone’s memories? What documents would be included? Is it an option to not have any additional factors or weights? The only other factor considered was equity adjustment, which did not move forward.

- **Gillian Adams:** Clarifying question – just using baseline to allocate units and no factors?
- **Eklund:** We have already decided on the 2050 households as the baseline, and the bottoms-up income allocation.
- **Adams:** There is nothing statutory that requires we have factors added. We could allocate RHNA units with just the baseline. In that case, bottom-up would not really apply since it is particular to income groups. That approach unwinds all the work we



have done, so would not recommend it. That approach would have to address how we plan to reach the RHNA objectives, and Plan Bay Area alone will likely not do that.

**Brown:** Stated that HMC already eliminated Option 4A when we met on September 4. Preferred to keep it at three options since it has already been settled because we need to move forward, not backwards.

**Brilliot:** Preferred Option 4A over options presented today. Clarifying question about the straw poll process, and secondary recommendation from the minority.

- **Arreguín:** Pierce suggested HMC send a primary recommendation and a secondary recommendation, with Option 4A being the secondary one. Ultimately, someone will have to make a motion, and then, someone can make a secondary option.

**Levin:** Shared concern about backtracking on decisions, and voiced opposition for Option 4A. Preferred to only send a primary recommendation, not a secondary one since they would be diametrically opposing approaches. If the minority members wanted to submit something on their own, that might be more appropriate.

Addressed those who are concerned about greenhouse gas emissions and jobs-housing balance. Stated that Options 6A and 8A both allocate more than half the housing to just ten jurisdictions. The housing would be very concentrated. Noted a strong preference for tools and data showing total allocation numbers rather than percentage growth rates, which can be misleading given the differing base populations.

The key question of RHNA "Who is taking what share of the new housing that we are planning for?" Under these scenarios, large core cities are taking on most of it.

**Pappas:** Stated that the main difference between Option 6A and Option 8A is that 8A moves almost 10,000 units of lower-income housing to San Francisco and Oakland. As Levin has reminded us, the RHNA process is about encouraging cities to zone for some modicum of multi-family housing. Stressed that it is an important social outcome. San Francisco is a pro-housing City, and Board of Supervisors would be supportive of more affordable housing. Concern that San Francisco is siphoning off affordable housing from other jurisdictions that need to step up to allow multi-family housing.

Supported a hybrid between Option 8A and Option 6A to put lower income housing into other jurisdictions to create homes for lower income people to promote equity.

**Martí:** Expressed opposition to discussing Option 4A to avoid setting a precedent that we move backwards on prior decisions. If we were going to discuss Option 4A, we should have requested data on it so we could analyze it. Leaned toward Option 6A or a blend with Option 8A.

Urged HMC to provide clarity to ABAG on their decisions with one recommendation instead of alternatives.

**Fierce:** Echoed that it is not feasible to consider Option 4. Noted that it performs worse on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, and other metrics. After listening to the discussion, heard a lot of the same arguments repeated. The results of the straw poll temperature check were pretty clear.

Made a motion that HMC recommend Option 8A.

- **Selander:** Seconded motion.

**Susan Adams:** Appreciated the motion to move the conversation forward. After HMC's decision today, it goes to the ABAG Executive Board. Asked a clarifying question if they can go back and choose alternatives that HMC has discarded?

- **Arreguín:** Technically that is an option, but the Executive Board should pay deference to the HMC desires.
- **Gillian Adams:** Yes, the Executive Board makes the final decision, but we have been in close communication with them throughout the process.
- **Susan Adams:** Appreciated the candidness. Thanked Pierce for comments.

**Romero:** Supported Brown's comment about moving backwards, and supported sticking with the options on the table. Would it be possible to make a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor to include Pappas's suggestion on a slight re-weighting to move towards equity and Furthering Fair Housing?

- **Arreguín:** That would be 70% high opportunity areas, 15% jobs proximity-transit, and 15% jobs-housing fit?
- **Romero:** Correct. Would that be an acceptable amendment to Fierce's motion?
- **Fierce:** Supported the idea conceptually, but wary about adding in new factors without first seeing the data. Rejected the friendly amendment and moved forward with Option 8A as is.

**Brilliot:** Urged HMC to move forward with the motion on the floor, expressed support for it.

**Brown:** Called for the question.

**Arreguín:** If the majority of the HMC approves this motion, then ABAG staff would be asked to incorporate comments from the minority in some sort of "minority report" to the ABAG Regional Planning Committee and the ABAG Executive Board. Pierce and Adams seemed to want additional statements to be considered by Board and decision-making bodies.

- **Adams:** Nodded yes.

**Brown:** Objected because HMC has worked hard to come to a consensus. If the majority vote is to accept it, then submitting a minority report felt disrespectful to people who have already compromised to get to this consensus decision. Expressed that a "minority report" feels inappropriate and wanted to be noted on the record for opposing it.

- **Arreguín:** Encouraged HMC members who would like to submit their comments to the Executive Board, to send a letter. It will not be part of the HMC's official report.



**Eklund:** Requested to do a roll call vote.

- **Arreguín:** Confirmed it would be a roll call vote.

**Arreguín:** Since Public Comment was already taken, there is no need to open the floor again for it.

- **Matthew Lavrinets:** Confirmed.

**Arreguín:** Began roll call vote on Fierce’s motion to recommend to staff and ABAG Executive Board Methodology Option 8A with the bottom-up approach, and 2050 Households Baseline.

**Castro:** Conducted roll call vote.

**Adams:** Yes

**Addison:** Yes

**Arreguín:** Yes

**Bolaria Shifrin:** Absent

**Bonilla:** Yes

**Brilliot:** Yes

**Brown:** No

**Brown-Stevens:** Yes

**Campos:** Yes

**Clark:** No

**Dillon:** Yes

**Ebbs:** Yes

**Eklund:** No

**Fearn:** Absent

**Fierce:** Yes

**Fligor:** Yes

**Gentry:** Yes

**Hancock:** Absent

**Jordan:** Yes

**Kline:** Absent

**Levin:** Yes

**Littlehale:** Yes

**Macedo:** Abstain

**Martí:** Yes

**Nickens:** Yes

**Pappas:** Yes

**Pierce:** Yes

**Planthold:** Yes

**Ranelletti:** Yes

**Regan:** Absent

**Riley:** Yes

**Romero:** Yes

**Selander:** Yes



**Semonian:** No  
**Shrivastava:** Yes  
**Smith:** Yes  
**Matt:** Yes

**Castro:** Motion passes with four “no’s” and one abstention.

## 6. Adjournment/ Next Meeting

**Arreguín** Before we adjourn, since this is the last meeting, expressed sincere gratitude for everyone’s dedication and time on behalf of the entire ABAG Executive Board. The decision is important for housing options throughout the region. Looking forward to the end goal in the RHNA process with the final allocations next year.

Thanked group again for being able to come to consensus.

*Assorted praises of thanks for HMC members and ABAG staff.*

### Final Zoom Comments

**Ebbs:** To clarify my earlier statement: I believe that any of these options will require seismic shifts in every community's culture and policy. Some communities are more invested in these cultures and this change will be harder. Nobody will be immune. Best of luck!

**Semonian:** Should we only pick 1??

**Fierce:** I'm picking two of em

**Planthold:** 6A RED

**Planthold:** 7a GREEN

**Planthold:** 8A RED

**Fierce:** Can someone paste the vote tallies in the chat?

**Shipley:** 6A: 12 green, 16 red

**Shipley:** 7A: 10 green, 16 red

**Shipley:** 8A: 19 green, 13 red

**Fierce:** dope, thanks

**Ellen Clark:** Sorry mine was a red for 8A

**Brilliot:** Could we have a recap of what option 4 was?

**Shipley:** okay revised 8A count: 18 green, 14 red

**Planthold:** If we re-consider adding 4a, then would we be open to re-considering 5a,

**Planthold:** 6A,7a

**Fierce:** Adding more options at this point is re-opening a can of worms. I don't support us going beyond the four already on the table after months of whittling it down to these, its a poor idea.

**Walsh:** Agree. We should not revisit old options at this point.

**Nickens Jr:** Agreed.



**Romero:** I agree with Monica regarding 4A. No.

**Marti:** I agree, we should not revisit decisions made in the past

**Fierce:** And on top of that, we simply don't have the analysis of 4A's performance with the metrics to even begin to evaluate it.

**Riley:** Can we please not have new approaches proposed today?

**Planthold:** ? Are we now adding other options? The initial "motion" was to consider adding 4 a as a 2ndary recommendation.

**James Pappas:** yes I agree we should not be going backward

**Welton Jordan:** I support moving forward with one option of the three that have been vocally supported today.

**Planthold:** That has not been acted upon. Yet, we are getting other recommendations, further spreading out, rather than focusing our discussions.

**Riley:** Minority comment: Please incorporate the concerns about disproportionate growth in unincorporated areas, and consider setting a cap on the distribution under 8A.

**Planthold:** Support the motion to put 8A forward.

**Fierce:** \*virtual applause\*

**Brilliot:** Will there be RHNA Committee reunion?

**Brown:** cute

**Fierce:** I hope so, we need a group photo

**Riley:** Thank you Jesse!!!!

**Walsh:** Nice job everybody. Good work!

**Brilliot:** Great working with y'all. Great work staff!

**Fligor:** Great job! Thank you.

**Pappas:** Thanks everyone

