

## Fred Castro

---

**From:** Gillian Adams  
**Sent:** Friday, August 28, 2020 8:28 AM  
**To:** Fred Castro  
**Subject:** FW: HMC

FYI.

---

**From:** Paul Campos <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 27, 2020 9:24 PM  
**To:** Gillian Adams [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** HMC

### \*External Email\*

Hi Gillian,

I'm unable to attend tomorrow's meeting and wanted to provide you with my input.

On the three questions you've asked:

1. I support treating moderate the same as low and very low but this is a "yellow card" level preference, i.e, I can live with either.
2. I don't support using the evaluation criteria--I think the statutory factors are so subjective that any attempt to portray the results through the criteria creates an artificial veneer of objectivity. This is not a criticism of the criteria staff developed but more of a comment about the wisdom of the overall effort. I think folks need to judge the results themselves directly against the statutory criteria and come to their own conclusions without an intermediate filter.
3. I strongly support either 3a or 3b.

For me the access to opportunity factor should be the dominant factor. I would actually like to see the above moderate be allocated with 50% high opportunity rather than 40% but at 40% I'd show a yellow card. Anything less than the 40% for above moderate and 70% for the other categories would elicit a red card from me.

I can support either Jobs Housing Balance or Jobs Housing Fit for the jobs criteria.

I do not support applying more than two criteria for very low/low/moderate and above moderate respectively as I think doing so acts to dilute the impact of the most important criteria on the target income group(s). That is another reason for my support of 3a and/or 3b. Of the two I prefer 3a based on my answer to question 1 but this is not a strong preference. I would also support 3 b.

Thank you,

Paul

--

Paul Campos  
[REDACTED]