

From: [Edward Sing](#)
To: [Fred Castro](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Item 6a on Nov. 12, ABAG Regional Planning Committee Agenda Public Hearing on RHNA Proposed Methodology
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 8:39:42 PM

External Email

It would be greatly appreciated if you can pass this email on to the Regional Planning Chairman and Committee Members.

Dear Regional Planning Committee Chairperson Mitchoff and Committee Members:

I would like to add my support to Paul Foreman's comments to you, below regarding Item 6A of your November 12th Planning Committee meeting - in addition to the following:

One concern that arose during discussions of the recently defeated Measure Z in Alameda (which would have removed voter approved development restrictions in Alameda) is the susceptibility of Alameda to multiple natural hazards (earthquakes, liquefaction, sea level rise, tsunami surges). Although these hazards exist for many cities adjacent to San Francisco Bay, Alameda is unique in that egress from Alameda should such natural hazards occur and emergency response access to the island is limited to aging bridges and tunnels which are already overwhelmed during normal rush hour conditions. Adding RHNA 3900 housing units in the period from 2023 to 2030 would require building another 12000 (approximate) market rate units in order to achieve the RHNA target. This would increase the total number of housing units in Alameda by over 30% (approximate), burdening an already stressed infrastructure as well as exacerbating ingress onto and egress off of the island during emergency conditions. Such concerns should be reflected in the process of determining RHNA requirements for Alameda.

The RHNA requirements stress proximity to major city centers. This might have been a valid factor pre-Covid but now, it has been demonstrated that teleworking has greatly decreased the need for proximity to the major city centers and will inevitably create a need for more jobs in professional as well as service industries in more outlying cities. Such changing employment and housing needed characteristics should be reflected in the process of determining RHNA requirements for Bay Area cities. Even discounting potential changes in employment centers due to Covid, giving more weight to proximity to major business centers is somewhat tenuous, as pre-Covid, over 400,000 commuters used mass transit to commute from outlying cities into the major business centers.

I fully support the concept of social equity. However, I ask that you consider Paul Forman's and my concerns and viewpoints regarding the proposed RHNA requirements for the City of Alameda.

Thank you,

Edward Sing
[REDACTED]