

# January 24<sup>th</sup> Notes

# 21 Elements Website

# Factors

- Considered 14 factors
  - Discussion and voting
- Small groups so less sense of overall feeling
- Conversation was difficult because of the specifics
- Maps were hard to read

# Factors

- Future households - Based on Plan Bay Area (and market factors)
- Future jobs -
- Transit accessibility
- Access to high resource areas
- Existing need (cost burden)
- Existing need (overcrowding)
- Existing jobs
- Job accessibility
- Jobs-housing balance (commute shed)
- Jobs-housing fit (commute shed)
- Transit connectivity - TPAs
- Transit accessibility (current)
- Natural hazards
- Past RHNA performance

# Sense of the group

- Jobs (split between current and future) - Top priority
- High opportunity areas
- High transit areas
- Natural hazards is complicated and people were split on it

# HCD Comments to Other Regions

## High income/low income areas

- More lower-income RHNA to jurisdictions with more single-family homes or to jurisdictions with higher housing costs?
- Larger share of RHNA units in an income category to jurisdictions with a smaller share of existing households in that income category?
- More lower income RHNA to jurisdictions with no areas of high segregation/poverty or low resource areas and the most areas in high or highest resource census tracts, as defined in the HCD/TCAC Opportunity Maps?
- Jurisdictions with large low resource areas or areas of high segregation/poverty receive less lower income RHNA than the regional average?

## Job

- Incorporate long-range planning focused on infill development and job centers?
- Direct more lower income RHNA to jurisdictions with a higher overall number of low-wage jobs?
- Direct more lower income RHNA to jurisdictions with a higher number of low-wage jobs compared to units affordable to low-wage workers?

## Transit

- Does the methodology focus on where housing is needed to encourage transit ridership and reduce commutes?