### Process update

#### Topic-focused Working Groups

**Meeting #1, May**
- Reviewed existing conditions, issues, and opportunities
- Set preliminary goals

**Meeting #2, June**
- Refined goals
- Reviewed existing City policies
- Developed strategies and actions

**Meeting #3, July**
- Refined strategies and actions
- Identified indicators and targets

**Prioritization Survey**

#### Advisory Committee

**September**
- Reviewed synergies and conflicts
- Provided feedback on proposed and prioritized actions

#### Topic-focused Working Groups

**December**
- Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations (both near-term and aspirational).
- Identify a final list of 3-5 indicators that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals.

#### Community feedback

**Fall ‘17**
- Public engagement on goals

**Winter ‘18**
- Discuss overall actions within the context of the citywide plan and scenario analysis
- Set targets based on the preferred scenario.

**Community feedback**

**Winter ‘18**
- Public workshop on scenarios
Today’s agenda

**Meeting objective:** Gain consensus on actions that will be written into the plan as recommendations, and select 3-5 indicators that the City will measure on an ongoing basis after the plan has been released.

- **Session overview** — 10 mins
- **Actions:** Discuss Working Group feedback on the Priority Matrix developed by City and consultant teams. Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations. *(Facilitated exercise)* — 75 mins
- **Indicators:** Present indicators recommended by the planning team that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals. Discuss indicators and identify a final list of 3-5 to be included in the plan. — 45 mins
- **Next steps** — 10 mins
Essential Definitions

- **GOAL**: Broad, aspirational statement of what we want to achieve
- **Strategy**: Approach or approaches that we take to achieve a goal
- **Action**: Specific policy, program, or tool we take to achieve a strategy
- **Indicator**: Quantitative measure(s) used to assess performance against goal
- **Target**: Desired level of performance
Summary of public feedback on goals

- Overall, housing diversity, affordability, and stability were identified as strong priorities by the majority of responders.
- Many identified increasing overall supply as a priority too, but opinions were divided as seen through strongly worded comments.
- Those opposed were concerned that this would not make a substantial difference to rents and the issue cannot be solved by increasing supply in Cambridge alone.
- Responders also raised concern about building in the floodplain, advocating to stop building in 100- and 500-year floodplains.

“After 7 years of surging rents accompanied by a massive building boom, in 2016 Boston-area rents finally dropped a measly 1.7%, but this decrease was on the upper end of the market. Even the staunchest advocates of new construction admit that increasing the supply of housing will not make housing affordable.”

“We have a housing shortage. The only possible remedy for a housing shortage is to build more housing.”

“The only way to lower prices in a market economy is to increase the supply. Demand is only going up. The area needs increased density.”

Survey on draft goals: https://envisioncambridge.consider.it/
Session overview: Determining plan priorities

**Sorting:** Working with the City, the actions generated at the end of meeting #3 have been sorted into 4 categories based on expected impact and difficulty.

**Streamlining:** To bring the actions into a parallel style across all working groups, some of them have been rephrased or combined. We intended to make them more specific, and to sharpen them by replacing verbs such as “explore” or “encourage” with concrete actions that the City can pursue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy Wins</td>
<td>(high impact + low difficulty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major projects</td>
<td>(high impact / high difficulty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Ins</td>
<td>(low impact + low difficulty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Impact/High Difficulty actions</td>
<td>(low impact + high difficulty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Easy Wins**: Actions that are easier to accomplish and of a high impact. Should be a high priority for implementation.
- **Major projects**: Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. Worth doing, but may take more time to implement and should be prioritized carefully.
- **Fill Ins**: Actions that are easy to accomplish but of a low impact. Low priority but could be worthwhile.
- **Lower Impact/High Difficulty actions**: Actions that are hard to accomplish and of a low impact. Not worth the time nor effort and should not be considered.
Actions
Action categorization (Facilitated exercise)

Do you agree with the current placement of each action along the four quadrants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy Wins</th>
<th>Major projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(high impact + low difficulty)</td>
<td>(high impact / high difficulty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions that are easier to accomplish and of a high impact. Should be a high priority for implementation.</td>
<td>Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. Worth doing, but may take more time to implement and should be prioritized carefully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fill Ins</th>
<th>Lower Impact/High Difficulty actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(low impact + low difficulty)</td>
<td>(low impact + high difficulty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions that are easy to accomplish but of a low impact. Low priority but could be worthwhile.</td>
<td>Actions that are hard to accomplish and of a low impact. Not worth the time nor effort and should not be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Projects
(High impact / High difficulty)

Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. May be worth doing, but only considered after top recommendations are completed.

- Prioritize available City and other public land for disposition to develop affordable housing.
- Establish new funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale.
- Change base zoning to require family-sized units.
Indicators
Characteristics of a Good Indicator

An indicator is a quantitative measure used to assess performance against a goal. To guide the Working Group’s development of indicators, the following general characteristics of good indicators have been identified.

- Simple to understand and communicate
- Historic data is available and readily accessible
- Indicator is a true reflection of desired performance

Indicators That Do Not Meet These Criteria

- Distinctions between various types of dedicated affordable units
- Data identifying the reason(s) why former residents have left Cambridge and showing the extent to which rising housing costs are a factor
- Homeownership rate
Recommended housing indicators

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal Addressed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of dedicated affordable units as part of housing supply</td>
<td>Production and maintenance of affordable housing</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Housing Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new housing units produced annually</td>
<td>Increased housing supply</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Housing Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments in affordable housing production and preservation</td>
<td>Resources available for affordable housing opportunities</td>
<td>Annual City Budget; CDBG, HOME, and ESG Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of households with children in Cambridge</td>
<td>Housing stability for families</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income distribution of households in Cambridge</td>
<td>Income diversity</td>
<td>American Community Survey and City of Cambridge Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Alternative housing indicators

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal Addressed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of “expiring use” units preserved</td>
<td>Maintenance of affordable housing</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Housing Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparities in homeownership levels by race</td>
<td>Housing stability; Diverse community</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of resident households experiencing annual turnover</td>
<td>Preservation of existing affordable housing units</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of affordable housing residents successfully transitioned into housing that meets their means.</td>
<td>Diverse housing options; Housing stability</td>
<td>Cambridge Housing Authority; City of Cambridge Housing Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of cost burdened households</td>
<td>Diverse housing options; Mixed-income community</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents experiencing homelessness in Cambridge</td>
<td>Diverse housing options</td>
<td>Cambridge Continuum of Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of dedicated affordable units available to low-income and moderate-income residents</td>
<td>Diverse housing options; Mixed-income community</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?
Next steps
Upcoming citywide scenario analysis

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.

- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.

- The scenarios will be compared based on urban form outcomes and performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - Traffic impacts
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)
Study areas for citywide scenarios

- Mass Ave. Corridor
- Inman Square East
- Cambridge St. Corridor
- Charles St.
- Lechmere Square West
- North Point
- Cambridgeport South
- K2C2
- Cambridgeport Riverfront
- Prospect St.
- Star Market
- Alewife Area Plan

Legend:
- Recent planning areas
- Alewife study area
- Proposed areas for corridor analysis
- Potential areas of change
Next steps for Working Groups

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.

- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.

- The scenarios will be compared based on urban form outcomes and performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - Traffic impacts
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)

Public meeting on scenarios, Winter ’18

Working Group meetings #5, Winter ‘18
- Discuss overall actions within the context of the citywide plan and scenario analysis
- Set targets based on the preferred scenario