

Fred Castro

From: Pappas, James (CPC) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 4:25 PM
To: Eli Kaplan; Fred Castro
Cc: Gillian Adams
Subject: Re: Expressing support for RHNA allocation Option 3 and for alternative proposal for AFFH evaluative criteria

External Email

Yes I am fine with my comments going to my HMC colleagues and into the public record. I'm copying Fred here.

Thanks for checking-

James

From: Eli Kaplan [REDACTED]
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 at 4:20 PM
To: "Pappas, James (CPC)" [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Expressing support for RHNA allocation Option 3 and for alternative proposal for AFFH evaluative criteria

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello James,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts with us. Would you like me to forward this message to Fred Castro for distribution to the HMC and inclusion in the public record for the HMC meeting on Friday 9/4? No worries if you only wanted to share these thoughts with staff, but I wanted to check in case you wanted them sent to others as well.

Best,
Eli

Eli Kaplan
Regional Housing Policy Analyst
[REDACTED]

Pronouns: he/him/his

Bay Area Metro | bayareametro.gov
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Association of Bay Area Governments

From: Pappas, James (CPC) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 4:12 PM
To: Gillian Adams [REDACTED]

Cc: Aksel Olsen [REDACTED]; Dave Vautin [REDACTED]; Eli Kaplan

Subject: Expressing support for RHNA allocation Option 3 and for alternative proposal for AFFH evaluative criteria

External Email

Dear Gillian and colleagues-

After reflection over the last week I am writing to express my support for RHNA allocation Option 3 presented during our last Methodology Committee meeting as well as to support the proposal submitted by a group of Committee members for an alternative to the evaluative criteria for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH).

Option 3 seems to me to offer the clearest and most effective means to target the region's most pressing housing problems: equitable access to high opportunity areas and the need for housing close to jobs. This option also has the benefit of being easy to explain to the public and policy makers. In addition, I believe that this option addresses the need for the RHNA methodology to help achieve the region's VMT and GHG reduction goals by placing the bulk of housing growth in cities close to jobs and typically well-served by transit. Furthermore, the use of the 2050 Plan Bay Area household distribution as the baseline reflects the policies supporting infill development and reduced GHG and VMT already in the Plan. Regarding concerns about natural hazards, I think Option 3 would also minimize risks associated with natural hazards by encouraging more compact growth, though the onus remains on cities to appropriately plan for housing development in areas less at risk to those hazards.

At the last meeting I heard some desire from Committee members to include job proximity via auto or transit in the methodology. To address this issue, I would suggest the possibility of a modification to Option 3 to include three factors as follows:

- Job Proximity- Transit for Very Low and Low income household allocation and
- Job Proximity- Auto for the Moderate and Above Moderate allocation.
- For example in Option 3, VLI and Low income could be distributed 70% to Access to High Opportunity areas, 20% based on Job-Housing Fit, and 10% on Job Proximity- Transit. Moderate and Above Moderate could shift to 40% Access to High Opportunity, 40% Jobs-Housing balance, and 20% Job Proximity- Auto.
- I am neutral on how moderate income units are allocated, however, given that jobs housing fit relates specifically to lower wage jobs it made more sense to me to group moderate income with above moderate income units in relation to the factors in this option.

The logic for these suggestions is that access to opportunity and job access remain key considerations but that transit access is particularly key for lower income residents and auto proximity to jobs is relevant for all households of all incomes, but particularly moderate and above moderate income households.

Lastly I would like to express my support for the proposal for an alternative to the AFFH evaluative criteria submitted by Fernando Martí, Carlos Romero, Jeff Levin, and Rodney Nickens Jr. in their email sent Monday 8/31/20. Specifically their proposal is to (1) Identify Exclusionary Jurisdictions Through a Composite Score, and (2) Ensure Each Exclusionary Jurisdiction is Allocated its Fair Share of the Region's Very Low and Low-Income Allocations. This proposal is an alternative to metric 5b in the evaluative criteria presented at our last Methodology Committee meeting on 8/28. The proposal will help to ensure that the Methodology Committee, Regional Planning Committee, and ABAG Executive Committee have a clearer understanding of the performance of different RHNA approaches in relation to AFFH and ensure that more of the region's cities that exhibit exclusionary housing characteristics do more to provide equitable housing opportunities.

I want to state that I write as a planner for San Francisco expressing my professional opinion as a member of the Methodology Committee but I am not expressing an official policy position of the City and County of San Francisco. I look forward to continuing the conversation with colleagues on the Methodology Committee and staff this Friday.

Thank you for your ongoing work on the methodology process-

James

James Pappas, Senior Policy Planner
Citywide Planning Division

San Francisco Planning

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17:

 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

IN ORDER FOR US TO MOVE, OUR OFFICE WILL BE CLOSED WITH NO ACCESS TO PHONES OR E-MAIL ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13 and FRIDAY, AUGUST 14. WE APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE.

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are available by e-mail, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is encouraged to participate. Find more information on our services here.