Association of Bay Area Governments

Housing Methodology Committee

September 4, 2020   **Agenda Item 5.a.**

RHNA Methodology Concepts

Subject: Refining RHNA Methodology Concepts

Background: The Housing Methodology Committee's (HMC) objective is to recommend to the Executive Board an allocation methodology for dividing up the Bay Area's Regional Housing Need Determination among the region's jurisdictions. This Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) methodology is a formula that calculates the number of housing units assigned to each city and county, and the formula also distributes each jurisdiction's housing unit allocation among four affordability levels.

At the August 13th HMC meeting, the committee came to consensus to move forward with using **2050 Households from the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint** as the baseline allocation and the **Bottom-Up** income allocation approach as the foundation for the RHNA methodology. At the August 28th HMC meeting, the members reached consensus that moderate-income units should not be shifted to using the same factors and weights as very low- and low-income units. Committee members also started discussing the factors and weights that best complement this foundation to allocate RHNA units in an equitable manner, but more time was needed for additional conversation on this topic.

Issues: The September 4 meeting will focus on continued discussion of factors and weights. In response to feedback from the HMC, staff has augmented the three options presented on August 28th with Options 4A, 5A, and 6A:

- **Responding to feedback on role of transit in factors & weights:** Option 4A is similar to Option 1A, but with increased weight on the *Job Proximity – Transit* factor.
- **Responding to feedback underscoring the importance of high-opportunity areas:** Option 5A is similar to Option 2A, but with the *Access to High Opportunity Areas* factor in place of the *Jobs-Housing Balance* factor for allocating moderate- and above moderate-income units.
- **Responding to feedback on job proximity versus jobs-housing balance:** Option 6A is similar to Option 3A, but with the *Job Proximity – Auto* factor replacing the *Jobs-Housing Balance* factor for allocating moderate- and above moderate-income units.

September 4, 2020   Agenda Item 5.a.

RHNA Methodology Concepts

Option 1A: Jobs Emphasis	Option 4A: Job Proximity Emphasis *(differences from 1A underlined)*
Very Low and Low	*Very Low and Low*
40% Access to High Opportunity Areas	40% Access to High Opportunity Areas
20% Job Proximity – Transit	<u>40%</u> Job Proximity – Transit
40% Jobs-Housing Fit	<u>20%</u> Jobs-Housing Fit
Moderate and Above Moderate	*Moderate and Above Moderate*
50% Job Proximity – Auto	<u>40%</u> Job Proximity – Auto
30% Job Proximity – Transit	<u>40%</u> Job Proximity – Transit
20% Jobs-Housing Balance	20% Jobs-Housing Balance
Option 2A: High Opportunity Areas & Jobs	**Option 5A: 50/50 High Opportunity Areas & Jobs** *(differences from 2A underlined)*
Very Low and Low	*Very Low and Low*
50% Access to High Opportunity Areas	50% Access to High Opportunity Areas
50% Jobs-Housing Fit	50% Jobs-Housing Fit
Moderate and Above Moderate	*Moderate and Above Moderate*
50% Jobs-Housing Balance	<u>50%</u> Access to High Opportunity Areas
50% Job Proximity – Auto	50% Job Proximity – Auto
Option 3A: High Opportunity Areas Emphasis	**Option 6A: Modified High Opportunity Areas Emphasis** *(differences from 3A underlined)*
Very Low and Low	*Very Low and Low*
70% Access to High Opportunity Areas	70% Access to High Opportunity Areas
30% Jobs-Housing Fit	30% Jobs-Housing Fit
Moderate and Above Moderate	*Moderate and Above Moderate*
40% Access to High Opportunity Areas	40% Access to High Opportunity Areas
60% Jobs-Housing Balance	<u>60%</u> Job Proximity – Auto

Recommended Action: Information

Attachment: A. Appendix 1 – Allocations by Income

                                B. Appendix 2 – Total Allocations

                                C. Appendix 3 – Maps of Methodology Options

                                D. Appendix 4 – Data Table

                                E. Appendix 5 – Performance Evaluation Results

Reviewed: _____

                               Brad Paul