

# AGENDA

## HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

## REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 4, 2016, 10:30 AM - 12:30 PM

Tamalpaia Conference Room #7102

MetroCenter

375 Beale Street, Suite 700

San Francisco, CA 94105

1. **Roll Call / Introductions (Chair, Julie Combs)** [ 10:30 / 5]
2. **Approval of agenda (Chair)**
3. **Approval of minutes from September 14<sup>th</sup> meeting (Chair)**
4. **Public Comment on items not on the agenda (Chair)**
5. **Session Overview & Updates (G. Adams)** [10:35 / 15]  
Gillian Adams, ABAG Senior Planner, will provide an overview of the meeting items and an update on recent Housing Program activities.
6. **Confirm Subcommittee Purpose (G. Adams)** [10:40 / 5]  
Gillian Adams, ABAG Senior Planner, will present changes to the Subcommittee Purpose based on discussion at the last committee meeting.
7. **Discussion of “Three Wishes” (Chair)** [10:45 / 90]  
Committee members will continue discussion of the three policies each has identified as priority policies that are impactful, actionable, and could garner ABAG support and commitment to action.
8. **Evaluation (plus/delta exercise) (Chair)** [12:25 / 5]
9. **Adjourn** [ 12:30 ]

**AGENDA FORECAST**

- Plan Bay Area 2040 “housing chapter” or “supplemental housing report”
- Safer, smarter homes through multi-benefit retrofits

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area



## SUMMARY MINUTES (DRAFT)

ABAG Regional Planning Committee – Housing Subcommittee

Wednesday, October 5, 2016

375 Beale St, San Francisco, California

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Julie Combs.

#### a. Members Present

Paul Campos, Building Industry Association of the Bay Area

Julie Combs, Councilmember, City of Santa Rosa (Chair)

Pat Eklund, Mayor, City of Novato

Michael Lane, Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California

Matt Regan, Bay Area Council

#### b. Members Absent

Paul Peninger, AECOM

Carlos Romero, Urban Ecology

### 2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by acclamation.

### 3. Approval of the September 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved by acclamation.

### 4. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

### 5. Session Overview and Updates

The session overview highlighted the topics that would be the focus of the meeting: reviewing the subcommittee's statement of purpose, discussing exploration of a regional housing trust fund, and the "Three Wishes" policy priorities. There was also a review of the draft Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Progress Report, and an update that the OBAG2 housing policy guidance for congestion management agencies (CMAs) had been delayed.

## **6. Review Subcommittee Purpose**

Members were generally satisfied with the latest iteration of the statement of purpose. The language was amended to read “policy-level housing actions” in the second sentence. There was also a request to add a reference to the diverse perspectives represented by committee members.

## **7. Regional Housing Trust Fund**

Several members had filled out the online survey as a way to organize and gauge priorities for the regional housing trust fund (RHTF). Some members completed their hard copy survey during the meeting. Other members provided suggestions on particular questions and/or the overall order and structure of the survey. Staff is hoping to get 100% member feedback by next meeting to make any changes necessary before further dissemination with other stakeholders in early 2017.

Staff gave an overview of plans to begin the “listening sessions” with core RHTF constituents, jurisdictions, CDFIs, and existing housing trusts to help us narrow our focus on key elements of the RHTF. Staff solicited additional contacts for this early round of interviews. Committee members expressed interest in ensuring that members of the public, for-profit developers, and foundations had opportunities to provide input. They also wanted the workshops to focus more on a conversation among participants rather than simply presenting information to them.

Members discussed the trust fund’s capitalization, offering different ideas, including issuing bonds, using tax-increment financing (TIF), and getting large companies and/or tech funds to contribute.

## **8. Discussion of “Three Wishes”**

Members individually presented their three housing policy wishes, ideally addressing policies that are actionable, high-impact and could gain the support of the RPC. The feedback was a broad mix of policies focused on streamlining development, reforming RHNA, TIFs and infrastructure financing districts (IFDs), housing cap & trade between cities, and imposing fees on cities whose limited housing production means that workers must move to regions with significantly higher per capita carbon footprints.

Staff agreed to compile the three wishes and circulate the draft to all members after the meeting.

**9. Evaluation**

At the request of Chair Combs, at the end of each meeting, committee members and staff provided feedback about positive aspects of the meeting as well as suggestions to improve future meetings. Positives noted were the pace of the three wishes discovery process, each other's company, the actionable timing of policy discussions, the facilitation, and good workplan input. Suggestions for change included the meeting time overage, the formality of the meeting, and making an even greater effort to create an atmosphere where new ideas can emerge.

**10. Adjourn**



## ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area



Date: November 9, 2016  
To: RPC Housing Subcommittee  
From: Gillian Adams, Senior Regional Planner  
Subject: Session Overview & Workplan Progress Report

---

### **Session Overview**

The first item on the agenda is review of the statement of the committee's purpose that staff has revised based on feedback from the committee. This will be followed by a continuation of the discussion about the "three wishes" that have been identified by each committee member as priority policies that are impactful, actionable, and could garner ABAG support and commitment to action.

### **Workplan Progress Report**

#### ***Regional Housing Trust Fund***

Staff has conducted 10 exploratory interviews so far. The list of pending interviews has grown to over 30. It is apparent already that we would have many enthusiastic, qualified presenters if, at a first convening, there is an opportunity for organizers of serious works-in-progress to pitch their projects, and an informed audience to query and critique. Early interviews are already helping us sketch three general scenarios. The pitches of prototype concepts could include one or two examples of each.

Scenario-A: Organize a signature fund that serves a relatively unoccupied niche; then raise funds; later broaden the focus as the fund gains momentum.

Scenario-B: Organize a signature new source of funds to create a large pool with broad use guidelines; then sort out details about uses once the money flows.

Scenario-C: Catalyze or incubate or support a "family" of multiple funds that collaborate under an "umbrella" or "compact," perhaps pooling some efforts to address hardest-to-fill niches.





## ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area



### Purposes of the Housing Subcommittee of the ABAG Regional Planning Committee

Staff recommends that the Regional Housing Subcommittee (Committee) adopt a statement of purpose, and resolve to review and update the statement annually.

Based on committee discussion at the previous meeting, Staff offers the following revised draft for consideration.

The purpose of the Committee is two-fold. The primary purpose is to identify, and advance through the ABAG RPC and ABAG Executive Board, policy-level housing actions that the Committee believes (1) would make a positive impact that is substantial in scale, (2) involves implementation tasks appropriate to ABAG's role (i.e., "actionable"), and (3) could garner ABAG support and commitment to action.

~~An additional purpose is to~~ The committee will also provide diverse opinions and perspectives and serve as a sounding board and knowledge resource, available to ABAG's housing program staff as they advance specific already scoped deliverables in the Housing Program's work plan.



Summary of Committee Members’ “Three Wishes”				
	Wish 1	Wish 2	Wish 3	Lagniappe (extra)
Paul Campos	<p>1. Residential and mixed-use projects that are consistent* with the use, density, and intensity specified in either the local general plan or the region's SCS** shall be processed "by right" and can only be denied or have the density reduced upon clear and convincing evidence of an imminent threat to public health and safety.</p> <p>*A project shall be deemed consistent if a reasonable person could conclude that the project is consistent and a court will not defer to a local government's determination that a project is inconsistent or that there is a health and safety issue. Attorney's fees awarded shall be awarded against a local government if it makes a determination of inconsistency that is overturned in court.</p> <p>**Once designated for residential or mixed use, these general plan and SCS sites cannot be downzoned or rezoned to reduce or eliminate housing except upon clear and convincing evidence of an imminent threat to public health and safety.</p>	<p>2. Reform RHNA so that the “need” for moderate and above moderate income units is determined by a dynamic methodology that is based on how much housing needs to be built to stabilize prices (e.g., LAO approach).</p>	<p>3. Reform property tax distribution so that the state guarantees that every new house permitted by a local government has a net positive fiscal impact on the city’s general fund for municipal services based on a uniform state-created fiscal impact methodology.</p>	

<b>Summary of Committee Members' "Three Wishes"</b>				
	<b>Wish 1</b>	<b>Wish 2</b>	<b>Wish 3</b>	<b>Lagniappe (extra)</b>
Julie Combs	1. Infrastructure Financing Districts (IFDs)	2. Inclusionary Zoning for all cities	3. Transfer taxes	4. 4. Living Wage 5. Municipal pension funds for moderate income housing
Pat Eklund	1. Bring back the RDA for housing and commercial development	2. RHNA reform so that all units are counted, including ADUs and Junior units	3. Commercial development should provide workforce housing	4. If state declares a housing crisis, state funding should be available to build.
Michael Lane	1. The state should incentivize building permits for RHNA	2. Regional Cap N Trade	3. Local tax increment financing (TIF)	4. Statewide housing bond
Paul Peninger	1. Regulatory reform at the local level to allow housing development by right in infill areas that are well served by transit and community amenities. This would be broadly consistent with Governor Brown's housing fast track legislation.	2. Legislative reform to clarify that inclusionary housing is permitted for rental developments. I would like to see inclusionary housing in most cities, but with the understanding that requirements should be calibrated to match local market conditions.	3. A permanent dedicated source of funding for a Statewide or regional housing trust fund.	

Summary of Committee Members' "Three Wishes"				
	Wish 1	Wish 2	Wish 3	Lagniappe (extra)
Matt Regan	1. Two recent studies from UC Riverside and UCLA are showing that the dire shortage of housing in California, particularly coastal California, is forcing many thousands of California's residents and employers to move to lower cost of living states such as Texas. With the continuing migration of middle income workers out of California, any environmental review of proposed new housing must have as its baseline a presumption that "no project" equals people moving to Texas where the average resident generates 26.9 metric tons of CO2 per year, compared to 9.26 tons in California. Projects mitigations that result in fewer units must be treated similarly. Carbon leakage is considered in other countries when climate policies are adopted, it needs to be considered here too.	2. We have Cap and Trade for big polluters and it has created a market based incentive for them to reduce pollution. We have no such incentive based system for cities to build housing next to jobs or next to transit. 40% of our GHGs come from cars stuck in ever worsening traffic and if we are to reduce this we need to force cities that refuse to build housing to pay into a Regional Housing Trust Fund that can be accessed by cities that want to build housing. If Palo Alto refuses to build housing, it can pay San Jose to build housing.	3. A housing State of Emergency ought to be declared, and for 3 years all laws, save for health and safety, that add to the cost of plan compliant housing that or otherwise make it more difficult to build must be set aside.	
Carlos Romero	1. All cities will be required to offset/mitigate the actual induced housing need (at all income levels) created when commercial/ retail developments are approved within their city limits.	2. Prop 13 tax reform approved that adopts a split roll and apportions at least 25% of the additional tax proceeds from this reform to affordable housing development.	3. Housing Impact Fees/ Inclusionary zoning adopted by all 101 cities and all nine counties.	4. Private, public, and non-profit development interests compromise on a way to approve a Bay Area document fee to support housing development.

