October 14, 2016

ABAG Administrative Committee with the MTC Planning Committee
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, San Francisco, CA
info@PlanBayArea.org

RE: Item 5 Plan Bay Area Preferred Scenario
via email

To Whom It May Concern:

These comments are submitted by the Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department to note its concerns with the Draft Preferred Scenario of Plan Bay Area. HCD is concerned that some policy items are deficient in the areas of anti-displacement mitigation and housing affordability for the region’s low-income households.

The UrbanSim model utilized in the Plan should employ holistic, representative land use assumptions to reflect a realistic vision for growth. To that end, the anti-displacement policies, recent second unit legislation, public lands consideration, inclusionary zoning, and overall land use distribution in the Plan should be altered to reflect that realism.

(1) Anti-placement policies should be included in the Plan.
   As the MTC Commission directed CMAs to award jurisdictions with adopted anti-placement policies additional points for transportation projects, the region would benefit from an analysis of the impact of anti-placement policies in preventing low-income households from displacement.

(2) The impact of the recent easing of second unit restrictions should be considered.
   UrbanSim should consider the impact of the recent passage of SB 1069 and AB 2406, which lifted several restrictions to the creation of second units.

(3) UrbanSim should assume compliance with the Surplus Land Act.
   The MTC Commission adopted guidelines requiring all general law jurisdiction recipients of OBAG funding to adopt resolutions regarding how their disposition of public land complies with California’s Surplus Land Act. Therefore, UrbanSim should assume that:
(a) 35% of the units developed on BART-owned land will be affordable to low-income households, consistent with BART’s proposed November 2016 TOD policy update;
(b) 35% of the units developed on land owned by VTA will be affordable to low-income households, consistent with VTA’s policy; and
(c) At least 25% of the units developed by affordable housing developers on publicly-owned land will be deed-restricted affordable to low-income households, consistent with the Surplus Lands Act.

(4) The inclusionary zoning assumptions should be adjusted.
The UrbanSim assumptions regarding inclusionary housing should be adjusted in the following ways:

(a) The income affordability of inclusionary units should be specified as an output of the model; and
(b) Inclusionary zoning should only be assumed for the development of ownership housing in order to be consistent with the State Supreme Court ruling in Palmer.

Please feel free to contact me at (510) 670-5939 or linda.gardner@acgov.org.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Linda M. Gardner
Director