Fresno COG RHNA Subcommittee Meeting 3

Summary

Date: May 20, 2021
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Via zoom

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS, ALTERNATES, AND OTHER FRESNO COG MEMBER JURISDICTIONAL STAFF PRESENT

City of Clovis: Dave Merchen, Planner; Renee Mathis, Community Development Director; Chelsey Payne and Kim Untermoser, Consultants; and Lily Cha, Planning Assistant

City of Coalinga: Sean Brewer, Community Development Director

City of Firebaugh: Karl Schoettler, Contract Planner

City of Fowler: Dawn Marple, Contract Planner, Thomas Gaffery, Community Development Director

City of Fresno: Jennifer Clark, Planning Director and Sophia Pagoulatos, Planner

County of Fresno: Bernard Jiminez, Deputy Director of Public Works & Planning Yvette Quiroga, Senior Staff Analyst, and Glenn Allen, Division Manager for Water and Natural Resources

City of Kerman: Jesus Orozco, Community Development Director and Michael Dozier, Planner

City of Mendota: Cristian Gonzales, City Manager, Jeff O'Neal, Contract Planner

City of Parlier: Sara Allinder, Contract Planner

City of Reedley: Ellen Moore, Planner

City of Sanger: David Brletic, Planner

City of San Joaquin: Matt Flood, Assistant City Manager

City of Selma: Fernando Santillan, Community Dev. Director

Fresno County Housing Authority: Michael Duarte, Planning Director

Building Industry Association of Fresno and Madera Counties: Mike Prandini, Executive Director

Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability: Karla Martinez, Policy Advocate

Note: though some agencies may have multiple representatives present at Subcommittee meetings, per the Subcommittee Charter, each member agency shall have a single vote on all decision points and recommendations.

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS PRESENT

Fresno COG

Kristine Cai, Deputy Director

Robert Phipps, Deputy Director

Meg Prince, Senior Regional Planner

Seth Scott, Senior Regional Planner

Trai Her-Cole, Associate Regional Planner

Braden Duran, Associate Regional Planner

PlaceWorks

David Early, Principal-in-Charge

Andrea Howard, Project Manager

Allison Giffin, Assistant Project Manager

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT

Janine Nkosi, Faith in the Valley

Gail Miller, Measure C Oversight Committee

Jim Hunter, Measure C Oversight Committee

Tom Brinkhuis, California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

George Uc, Fresno LAFCo

APRIL MEETING REVIEW

Subcommittee Meeting #2 was briefly summarized. Subcommittee members and other attendees were referred to the [Project Website](), where Meeting 2 Slides and Summary are posted.

STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARY

PlaceWorks, the consultant team supporting Fresno COG's 6th Cycle RHNA development, summarized two stakeholder meetings held on May 19, with 11 non-staff participants (non-project staff) representing the following organizations and jurisdictions:

- California Assemblymember Joaquin Arambula's office

- Measure C Citizens Oversight Committee

- California Rural Legal Assistance

- Faith in the Valley

- City of Firebaugh

- City pf Fresno

- City of Parlier

- City of Sanger

PRESENTATION: DATA REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY TOOL INTRODUCTION

PlaceWorks presented the revised list of datasets collected relating to the Factors and Objectives, which were updated to reflect feedback from Subcommittee Meeting 2. Subcommittee members were polled on which proposed factor to use as a base allocation, and which adjustment factors they prefer to include in the allocation tool.

Discussion

Comment: Several of the proposed base allocation options use estimates or projections that come from the RTP/SCS (current population, projected population, and projected growth 2020-2050). There is no mandate that requires the base factor to reflect the RTP/SCS. However, choosing any of these factors for the base allocation would make the RHNA more consistent with the RTP/SCS.

Question: There is no guarantee that an incorporated jurisdiction can annex properties in the Sphere of Influence (SOI), so why was the SOI population included in the population-based base allocation options?
Answer: If there is development in those areas, it is most likely going to be approved by the jurisdiction with the SOI. The likelihood of annexation is also why Fresno COG includes the SOI in the population projections, so if we used projected population as the base allocation, it would necessarily include the SOI.

Comment: The City of Fresno and Fresno County do not have a tax agreement, so the City cannot count lands within the Sphere of Influence because they cannot be included in the City's Housing Element. Because it is difficult to reach a tax agreement for new development within the City of Fresno's SOI, I recommend using current population data as the base allocation rather than projections, and only include the city limit rather than population within the sphere but outside the city limit. Also, projections tend to be aspirational, while current population estimates are more accurate.
Response: Using population projections would be more consistent with the RTP/SCS, but current estimates are more accurate in terms of what is 'on the ground' now.

Comment: Either projected population or household growth would be good base factors. These figures dictate where demand is and where growth will occur. Either of these options will best enable us to prepare for the future.
Response: Any of the proposed base factors are also available to use as adjustment factors.

Comment: I like the certainty of looking at existing numbers but using projections would enable jurisdictions to get 'credit' for what they are already planning to build, so projections (jobs or population) are preferred as the base factor.

Comment: Projected jobs is the best base allocation because we want to build housing where jobs are expected to grow, especially to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) related to commutes.
Response: if we used a base factor related to population but use job growth as an adjustment factor, would this also be satisfactory? (yes).

Comment: Job growth is an important factor. It is equally acceptable to use job growth as the base factor, or to use any of the household or population base factors, provided job growth is included as an allocation factor.

Question: The poll indicated that more than half of subcommittee members chose projected population or population growth as the preferred base factor. Could we vote on either of those two options?

Comment: The Department of Finance (DOF)'s population projections for the City of Fresno have been very inaccurate for decades. For this reason, using the share of growth over the previous 8-year period, or population or housing growth (projected minus current), would be better than just using either projected households or projected population.

Response: The 'projections' measures include current estimates plus the added growth. In other jurisdictions, we have found that 'growth' or the difference between current and projected estimates is often the most dramatic measure.

Question: Are group quarters included in the population-related factors? They should not be.

Answer: PlaceWorks will make sure that populations in group quarters are removed from all population-related factors.

Comment: Share of previous 8-year growth shows real trends, and therefore should be weighed heavier than projections in the future. Jobs are also an important input.

Question: Will any of these factors relate to how units are distributed by income?

Answer: No, none of the factors will adjust how units are distributed by income in each jurisdiction, because we are using the income allocation methodology to allocate units by income threshold in each jurisdiction.

Comment: I understand the importance of the income-shift approach, but it is important to look at other factors specifically for the income-shift piece of the allocation. The following datasets would all be relevant not only to the overall unit allocation, but also the allocation by affordability level: vacancy rate, cost-burden, overcrowding, distribution of housing type, availability of land, and the cost to build. The GIS-based factors could represent the last two (availability of land and the cost to build).

Comment: The most important categories (to use as adjustment factors) are: jobs-housing balance, vacancy rate, overcrowding, and affordable housing as a share of all housing in each jurisdiction. However, the TCAC score rolls up all of these into one score. Additionally, the State awards funding for affordable housing developments based on the TCAC scores, so TCAC is important for where projects are likely to be built.

Comment: Any base factor related to population or housing units is good. The share of previous 8-year growth should be included as an adjustment factor.

Comment: HCD reviews the methodology to ensure that the methodology furthers the five statutory objectives mentioned in prior meetings. HCD looks at how the factors used in the methodology relate to those objectives. If you put more housing in areas with high overcrowding and high cost-burden, this might indicate more housing in lower-opportunity areas and that might be run counter to the objective of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, which focuses on concentrating more housing (and more affordable housing) in higher-opportunity neighborhoods.

Comment: We should combine all the amenity scores together into one, so that they work hand-in hand with the opportunity scores.

Comment: The TCAC data indicates where affordable housing projects will get funded. The AARP opportunity score does not. TCAC awards points for projects that are in high-opportunity areas, but also to projects that are in low-opportunity areas which also meet other criteria (e.g. proximity to mass

![Fresno Council of Governments logo] Fresno Council of Governments

2035 Tulare St., Ste. 201
Fresno, California 93721

tel 559-233-4148
fax 559-233-9645

www.fresnocog.org

transit). Aggregating the TCAC numbers is hard if we are looking at the ability of a project to get funding, because there is variation across census tracts. A better measure, if we are looking at the ability for an affordable housing project to be funded, is 'acres in the jurisdiction with a high TCAC score.' I do not think any Transit Oriented Development (TOD) funding has been awarded anywhere in the Central Valley.

Comment: The composite TCAC score does not look at the ability for affordable housing projects to get funded. Summing the acres of high-opportunity TCAC acreage in each jurisdiction would be a better score of 'ability to fund' than the composite score of a single jurisdiction.
Response: The composite TCAC Opportunity score is a more general measure of opportunity attributed to each jurisdiction as a whole.

Response: TCAC is important, but we need to keep in mind that the yield for TCAC projects might be measured in terms of a couple hundred housing units at most. For Clovis alone, the entire RHNA allocation will be somewhere between 6,000 and 10,0000 units, so the TCAC scores may represent just a fraction of the housing projects that may be built. We understand that HCD puts high weight on opportunity, so maybe TCAC should be blended with one of the broader scores (like AARP) to create a more well-rounded score of opportunity.

NEXT STEPS

No clear consensus emerged on any one preferred base allocation or set of adjustment factors, but the list of options was narrowed considerably at the conclusion of the discussion. The list of proposed base allocations was narrowed down to include the following population-based options:

- Current Population (2020)
- Projected Population (2050, includes SOI)
- Population Growth 2020-2050 (includes SOI)
- Share of previous 8-year population growth (2012-2020)

The list of proposed adjustment factors was narrowed down to the following options:

- **Factors Related to Housing**
    - Percent of vacant (unoccupied) units
    - Percent of households that are cost-burdened
    - Percent of households that are overcrowded
- **Factors Related to Opportunity**
    - TCAC opportunity score
    - AARP opportunity score
    - Percent of children (people under 18) living above poverty
- **Factors Related to Jobs**
    - Current regional share of jobs (2020)
    - Regional share of projected job growth (2020 - 2035)
    - Regional share of residents employed in agriculture, forestry, and fishing
- **Factors Related to Developable Lands**
    - Percent of constrained land, which includes: important agricultural lands, sensitive habitat lands, and all hazards (fire, flood, erosion, and earthquake hazards)

- **Factors Related to Population**
  - Population growth over the previous 8-year period

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

Prior to the 4th Subcommittee meeting on June 24, PlaceWorks prepared an interactive version of the RHNA allocation tool, which enables subcommittee members to input the different options for the base allocations, adjustment factors, and corresponding weights to see how different combinations affect the resulting distribution of RHNA units by jurisdiction. Subcommittee members were asked to prepare for RHNA Subcommittee Meeting 4, scheduled for June 24, by interacting with the tool and choosing their preferred base factor, preferred set of adjustment factors, and preferred set of factor weights to use in the RHNA allocation methodology.