Chairman Arreguin and esteemed members of the Housing Methodology Committee,

The 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process is a tremendous opportunity to address the pressing social, economic, and ecological need for more homes of all kinds in the Bay Area. It provides a chance to undo historic patterns of segregation and exclusion, expand access to economic opportunity, and establish more sustainable development patterns that will help the Bay Area be a global climate leader. To that end, we offer the following suggestions to the Housing Methodology Committee on how to best allocate the Bay Area’s housing need across jurisdictions.

Locating new housing in and near high opportunity areas should be a top factor in considering the share of total housing need allocated to each jurisdiction. Using fair housing metrics for total housing need will most effectively advance the mandate to affirmatively further fair housing and promote the greatest expansion of housing opportunities in resource-rich communities, many of
which have an unfortunate legacy of exclusion that must be overcome. Promoting greater
housing opportunities in these neighborhoods is a proven way to help advance regional
priorities such as economic mobility, as well as being the metric most clearly consistent with the
statutory requirement to affirmatively further fair housing. It is crucial for this metric to be used
throughout the allocation process, rather than only to allocate the low-income share of housing
need, to ensure that more housing of all types is built where it is needed most. In this way,
allocation based on access to high opportunity areas can also advance the statutory
requirement to increase housing supply & mix of housing type across all jurisdictions in an
equitable manner.

Proximity to jobs should be the other highest-weighted metric in allocation, advancing both the
statutory requirement to promote improved regional jobs-housing balance and the requirement
to promote infill development and efficient development patterns. It is critical to our climate goals
that we give people more opportunities to live closer to work, shortening commutes and making
it easier for them to choose non-car modes of transportation. Jobs proximity is a preferred
metric because it recognizes that people care less about jurisdictional lines than they do about
the chance for a shorter, more convenient commute. This metric, combined with the high
opportunity metric, will have the added benefit of allocating the most new housing to the areas
in which high demand makes those homes most likely to actually be built.

The “natural hazard” metric does not appear to be effective, as currently constituted, at avoiding
development in high risk areas. In fact, it would have the effect of shifting more growth toward
areas in the North Bay, such as Windsor and unincorporated Santa Rosa County, that have
seen some of the most prominent and destructive natural disasters of recent years. There are
very few if any Bay Area cities that truly lack enough safely buildable land to accommodate their
share of the housing growth we need as a region. The best way to protect against natural
hazards such as fire is to promote compact infill growth in the Bay Area’s jobs-rich core.

In addition to weighting factors, we also need a robust evaluative framework for analyzing the
eventual allocation methodology. This framework should include consideration of how well the
allocation affirmatively furthers fair housing and supports a reversal of historic patterns of
segregation and exclusion; how well the proposed housing growth pattern supports a reduction
of greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled in both commutes and non-work trips;
opportunities for transit oriented development along both current and potential future quality
transit corridors; and whether the proposed allocation is consistent with patterns of housing
demand that shape where new homes are most likely to actually be built.

At the core of the Bay Area’s housing crisis is a failure by cities across the region to permit
adequate housing for its residents at all levels of affordability. Previous RHNA cycles have
unfortunately contributed to this failure, through inadequate overall goals and an inequitable
distribution of new homes that concentrated most housing in a few locations. In recent years,
the state responded to these shortcomings by passing several laws to reform the RHNA
process. The current RHNA cycle is an opportunity to correct those inequities and ensure that
all Bay Area cities permit abundant and affordable housing near jobs, transit, and other key community resources. We hope our suggestions will help the Housing Methodology Committee make the most of it.
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