

From: [Victoria Fierce](#)
To: [Gillian Adams](#)
Cc: [RHNA](#); [Fred Castro](#)
Subject: Re: Absurdly low RHNA allocation
Date: Thursday, June 18, 2020 6:08:10 PM

External Email

I see, thanks.

I strongly feel that the methodology committee should be discussing the one and only input to our work product. It has already been said many times that RHNA needs to align with Plan Bay Area, which includes its own population projections that don't match up with the ones provided by the Department of Finance. We're here to advise the ABAG Board on a methodology, and we have advice to give on whether or not the board should accept the determination or ask that it be even further aligned with Plan Bay Area.

On Thu, Jun 18, 2020 at 1:57 PM Gillian Adams <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Victoria,

Thank you for your message. The Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) from HCD will be discussed at the ABAG Executive Board tonight, and I recommend that you attend that meeting if you want to learn more about the RHND process or comment on the outcome. Details about the meeting are available at <https://abag.ca.gov/meetings/executive-board-2020-jun-19>.

We are not planning to discuss the RHND at the HMC meeting, since it is the ABAG Board that will make the decision about whether to accept HCD's determination or file an objection.

Regards,

Gillian

Gillian Adams

Principal Planner, Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

[REDACTED]

Association of Bay Area Governments

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

From: Victoria Fierce <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 11:45 AM
To: RHNA <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Fred Castro <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Absurdly low RHNA allocation

Hi, RHNA facilitators.

I just reviewed our packet for tomorrow and saw that the bay area was assigned 441,176 units for our regional number.

SCAG got 1.3 million for a population of 19 million. ABAG represents upwards of 8 million people. If we scaled SCAG's allocation according to population, which is about 42%, the bay area's allocation should be at least 500,000. Even during all of our committee discussions, most folks were expecting an allocation far above even that number, given that our housing shortage is so much more severe than in SCAG.

I realize its literally the day before and that doesn't give staff much time to prepare, but can we expect a good explanation of this discrepancy? Specifically, I want to know why such a low allocation differs from our group's consensus that we should expect an allocation even higher than we imagined, with a look at what data and methodologies HCD relied on in determining this number.