Meeting Notice and Agenda

Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Friday, April 26, 2019

12 noon to 1:15 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Staff Contact: Robyn Wapner
(619) 699-1994
robyn.wapner@sandag.org

Agenda Highlights

• Regional Housing Needs Assessment Workshop

Please silence all electronic devices during the meeting

Message from the Clerk

In compliance with Government Code §54952.3, the Clerk hereby announces that the compensation for legislative body members attending the following serial meetings is: Board of Directors (BOD) $150, and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Subcommittee $100. Compensation rates for the BOD and RHNA Subcommittee are set pursuant to the SANDAG Bylaws.

Mission Statement

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Working Group on any item at the time the Working Group is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form and then present the form to the Working Group coordinator. Members of the public may address the Working Group on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Working Group may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the Working Group name and meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the meeting should be received by the Working Group coordinator no later than 5 p.m. two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official public record and will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for email notifications at sandag.org/subscribe.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints, and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to the SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900 or (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。
请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices. To access the meeting room, please arrive on the 8th floor.
Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee  
Friday, April 26, 2019

Item No.       Action
+1.  Approval of Meeting Minutes  Approve
The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Subcommittee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its March 22, 2019, meeting.

2.  Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the RHNA Subcommittee on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a Request to Comment form and giving it to the meeting coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the meeting coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to RHNA Subcommittee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. RHNA Subcommittee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

Report
+3.  Regional Housing Needs Assessment Workshop (Seth Litchney)  Discussion
The RHNA Subcommittee is asked to provide feedback on potential RHNA methodology, which was developed using input from the Board of Directors, RHNA Subcommittee, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and housing stakeholders.

4.  Upcoming Meetings  Information
The next RHNA Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 24, 2019, at 12 noon.

5.  Adjournment

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
March 22, 2019, Meeting Minutes

Chair Catherine Blakespear (North County Coastal) called the meeting of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Subcommittee to order at 12:01 p.m.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approve)

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Jim Desmond (County of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Mary Salas (Regional Planning Committee), the RHNA Subcommittee approved the minutes from its February 22, 2019, meeting. Yes: Chair Blakespear, Supervisor Desmond, Councilmember Kristine Alessio (East County), Mayor Richard Bailey (South County), and Mayor Salas. No: None. Abstain: Rebecca Jones (North County Inland). Absent: City of San Diego.

2. Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

   Kim Kawada, Chief Deputy Executive Director, discussed the governor’s budget trailer bill for housing.

3. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Priorities (Information)

   Coleen Clementson, Principal Regional Planner, provided the results of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Priorities Worksheets submitted by the Subcommittee members.

4. Potential Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation Methodology Framework (Discussion)

   Ms. Clementson presented a potential RHNA Allocation Methodology framework based on feedback from the SANDAG Board of Directors, the RHNA Subcommittee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and housing stakeholders. Additionally, Ms. Clementson asked the Subcommittee members to provide their preferred allocation emphasis.

   **Action:** This item was presented for discussion.

5. Upcoming Meetings (Information)

   The next Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 26, 2019, at 12 noon.

6. Adjournment

   Chair Blakespear adjourned the meeting at 12:59 p.m.
**Confirmed Attendance at SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee Meeting**

Friday, March 22, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>Catherine Blakespear, Chair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Monica Montgomery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Jim Desmond</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>Kristine Alessio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>Rebecca Jones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Richard Bailey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>Mary Salas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Planning Technical Working Group Comments on the Potential SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation Methodology Tool

City of El Cajon Community Development, Tony Shute (Submitted April 15)
- Only count transit (Trolley) stations that can support housing – stations close to airports or on federal land should not be counted (El Cajon’s Gillespie Field should be removed)
- Transit stops (bus) are subject to ridership and are routinely removed – perhaps this can be adjusted or greater weight given to rail (95% to rail and 5% to transit corridors)
- An affordable household smoothing factor/adjustment needs to be incorporated so that cities that have shouldered the affordable burden should not this time around, if possible, and those cities that are out of balance should take on those units – see equity slide
- Jobs – only count civilian jobs that support a household and are located near a job center

Housing You Matters, Deborah Ruane (Submitted April 16)
- The resulting numbers seem somewhat disconnected for the near-term potential of some of the cities. The SANDAG version ignores capacity and, while the allocation shouldn’t necessarily be bound by one jurisdiction’s conservative general plan vs. another’s, it shouldn’t totally ignore this fact, as it impacts the near-term practicality of providing the allocation. In looking at the Poway proposal, maybe inclusion of the General Plan Capacity has some merit in addressing this imbalance.
- I wasn’t sure about the weight of R&R (75%) vs HFT (25%) in the Transit section. If you have no R&R but tons of frequent (and mostly Rapid) buses (Coronado and Imperial Beach), is that equivalent to having an R&R but no frequent bus service to move people to and from the R&R site (San Marcos, Santee and Solana Beach) such that you would need a car or Uber to get to the R&R? Is SANDAG prepared to allocate transit spending to address this deficiency?
- If they include military jobs, do they need include military housing, or are the military jobs only those for which housing is not provided? Are they prepared to allocate a share of RHNA directly to the military in the cities where it has an impact?

City of Poway Development Services Department, David De Vries (Submitted April 16)
- Regarding your request for feedback on the Methodology Exercise Tool, I recommend the RHNA Allocation be based on the Series 14 Forecast by region and excess units be allocated as described in the attached PDF Alternative 1 (determination remainder) so as to provide a regional framework that supports the factors shown in the attached PDF and provides the region the best chance for meeting housing needs for the upcoming cycle, since existing regional and jurisdictional plans and state ADU obligations will be used to the full extent.
- Specific to the spreadsheet, population should not be a contributing factor, since it has not been a preferred or suggested method discussed at any of the workshops and does not support any of the factors shown in the attached PDF.
City of Del Mar Planning Department, Kathleen Garcia (Submitted April 16)

- Agree with the top priorities identified as “Proximity to Transit” and “Jobs/Housing Relationship.” The objective of these priorities is to increase transit use, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and relieve traffic congestion.
- Make sure that available land for development capacity to meet the RHNA number is also taken into consideration, so that no capacity is exceeded.
- To improve transit use, the potential RHNA allocation methodology should prioritize housing units in jurisdictions with rail and Rapid bus stations, while also providing units to areas with other high-frequency transit, such as bus lines with 15-minute intervals during peak hours.
- It is recommended that a 55-percent split go to “Proximity to Transit” in order to reduce GHG, fit with the Regional Plan, and recognize that jobs are spread throughout the County.
- Secondly, to reduce vehicle miles traveled and relieve traffic congestion, the RHNA allocation methodology should allocate housing units in jurisdictions with jobs, which could lead to shorter commutes.
- It is recommended that no more than 35% go to Jobs.
- Large parcels of State lands that contribute the majority (or at least a large percentage) of a jurisdiction’s jobs – such as the Fairgrounds in Del Mar – should be opened to housing development and be part of the State’s solution to the problem of housing.
- Agree that the housing allocation must consider low-wage jobs in each jurisdiction to ensure equity in the allocation of low-income and very-low-income housing near low-wage jobs. To ensure each jurisdiction receives housing units regardless of the jurisdiction’s proximity to jobs and transit, the potential RHNA allocation methodology of 10% based on the jurisdiction’s current population is appropriate.
- Throughout this entire methodology, SANDAG should ensure that this does not set up any jurisdiction to fail. A City’s allocation should not be impossible to meet or compromise sensitive lands.
- SANDAG should provide proof of the link of increased density with increased transit ridership. There is not necessarily agreement that increased density produces more ridership.

City of Oceanside Planning Division, Jeff Hunt (Submitted April 17)

- The jobs factor should be 50%, but should be based on the jobs:housing ratio rather than just the number of total jobs. We believe that jobs should be a larger factor than transit, because jobs are specifically listed in the Govt Code re RHNA, the location of jobs is more critical in determining someone’s housing location, and the ratio accounts for both a city’s jobs and housing numbers.
- The transit factor should be 40% with rail & Rapid 50% and HFT 50% because bus lines are far more numerous and provide more service than rail.
- The 10% population factor is okay. Existing population is a reasonable factor.
- An equity and housing mix factor should be added. Cities that have a higher percentage of low-income housing and multi-family housing should not have to take on a similar share as a city that has lower percentages in order to avoid concentrations and to provide lower-income housing in all cities.
• We do not support any capacity factor. The ramifications are not producing housing per a city’s RHNA
have increased (i.e. SB 35) and will likely continue to increase (transportation funds?), and just because a
city has not acted to accommodate housing doesn’t mean it should get a smaller RHNA share.

City of Carlsbad Planning Division, Don Neu (Submitted April 17)

• The City of Carlsbad appreciates the opportunity to provide comment on the draft RHNA methodology
exercise tool developed by SANDAG staff. We understand the tool is intended to assist SANDAG and
member jurisdictions in equitably allocating RHNA units in a manner that reflects the priorities
recommended by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee and furthers the objectives laid
out in Government Code Section 65584(d).

• Carlsbad generally agrees with the principles that housing allocations should be linked to transit systems
and near jobs centers where appropriate and feasible. The exercise tool provides a good start, but is
incomplete in its current form. We offer the following suggestions that we think will help get SANDAG
to an acceptable allocation methodology.

• With respect to the relative weightings of the priorities recommended by the RHNA Subcommittee,
Carlsbad supports a methodology that gives greater weight (>50%) to transit than to the jobs and
population priorities. Having a strong link between housing and transit reinforces the planning efforts
reflected in local General Plans (particularly those comprehensively updated within the last 5–10 years),
promotes the viability of Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, and furthers the goals laid out by SB 375 and
SANDAG’s Sustainable Communities Strategy.

• Secondary weighting could be given to the jobs factor (<50%). Locating housing closer to job centers
begins to address one of the state’s legislative objectives, but as drafted, the tool it is insufficient. The
tool could be improved by addressing not simply the number of jobs in a given jurisdiction relative to
housing units (jobs to housing ratio), but go further in addressing the jobs to housing matching, as required
by law.

• The RHNA methodology needs to consider the types of jobs (and incomes they support) in a jurisdiction
and how well they are matched to the housing profiles in that jurisdiction. Furthermore, the RHNA
methodology should account for how workers, even those living within the jurisdictions where they
work, can get to their jobs. Locating more housing in jobs areas not well-served by transit, which
describes much of North San Diego County, may or may not appreciably reduce vehicle miles traveled if
workers’ only viable means to get to work is still by car. We also note that some job centers have
developed as such in part because they are not conducive to housing. An example would be areas
surrounding an airport.

• Carlsbad believes that all jobs should be considered in the weighting factor, not just civilian jobs. Military
employees (and their families) need housing just as civilian employees do, so it seems odd to us that such
jobs would be excluded from the allocation methodology. However, it may be appropriate to adjust the
military jobs factor to account for employees housed on-base.

• Finally, Carlsbad suggests that the population factor be given the least weight (5–10% perhaps) among
the proposed priorities. We believe the linkage to furthering state objectives is the weakest of the three
and is not informative of a jurisdiction’s ability to accommodate housing. For example, two cities could
have similar populations but have vastly different capacities to accommodate housing. One city may be
largely “built-out” with housing opportunities limited to infill and redevelopment, while a similarly
populated city may have more available vacant land capacity.
• Once base allocations are made according to the priorities described above, Carlsbad suggests that the tool could be improved to further the objectives stated in GC 65584 (d) and adjust for the factors as described in Government Code Section 65584.04(e). In particular, we suggest SANDAG could modify the tool to adjust RHNA allocation for:

  • Availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use (65584.04(e)(2)(B)). An adjustment could be made for areas of a jurisdiction surrounding an airport where housing is designated an incompatible land use per an adopted airport land use compatibility plan. In Carlsbad, for example, the McClellan-Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan defines residential uses (especially at higher densities) as incompatible with the airport in certain areas due to safety (Safety Zones 1–5) and noise (areas subject to >65 db noise levels) concerns.

  • Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats, and natural resources on a long-term basis, including land zoned or designated for agricultural protection or preservation that is subject to a local ballot measure that was approved by the voters of that jurisdiction that prohibits or restricts conversion to non-agricultural uses. (65584.04(e)(2)(C)). An adjustment could be made for areas of a jurisdiction that are protected pursuant to a locally adopted habitat conservation plan and approved by state and/or federal wildlife agencies. For example, Carlsbad’s adopted Habitat Management Plan, which is the city’s subarea plan under SANDAG’s 2003 Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan, permanently conserves nearly 6,200 acres of biologically sensitive and ecologically valuable land. These lands are not available for accommodating housing needs. Additionally, there are agricultural lands in Carlsbad protected from conversion to residential use by a voter-approved ballot measure (Proposition D, 2006). These areas could similarly be discounted for RHNA allocation purposes.

  • Disproportionate shares of households within a particular income category relative to the region. In the past, this has meant either allocating more lower-income housing units to jurisdictions with higher-than-average household incomes or incentivizing with local transportation funds jurisdictions that plan for more lower-income housing. Land costs are highly variable throughout the region and are correlated to household incomes. Therefore, Carlsbad supports a RHNA methodology that is paired with financial support and incentives to provide affordable housing for all economic segments of the communities throughout the region.

**City of San Diego Planning Department, Laura Black (Submitted April 19)**

• The City of San Diego appreciates SANDAG’s efforts in creating the Draft RHNA Allocation Methodology Tool utilizing the factors of transit availability, jobs, and population for the upcoming RHNA cycle.

• The City supports the general methodology reflected within the tool and does not have a position at this time on the specific weighting of the three factors.

• We will support any allocation of units to the City that results from the different weighting of these factors given that the City has sufficient land use capacity to accommodate any potential allocation of units within the tool.
Potential SANDAG RHNA Allocation Methodology Alternative 1

Base RHNA
- General Plan Capacity – Series 14 Forecast
- Proximity to Transit (1/2 mile radius) 75% of RHNA Determination Remainder
- Accessory Dwelling Units 20% of RHNA Determination Remainder
- Jobs/Housing Relationship 5% of RHNA Determination Remainder

Supporting Factor 1
- Promote Emerging Technologies (e.g., micro transit, shuttles, autonomous vehicles, smart cities,)

Supporting Factor 2
- Preservation of Parks/Open Space
- Preservation of Agriculture
- Preservation of Biological Resources
- Limit Housing in High Fire Areas

Supporting Factor 3
- Reduction of Vehicles Miles Traveled
- Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions