

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Programming and Allocations Committee**

July 13, 2022

Agenda Item 2f - 22-0070

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Progress Report (2018-20)

Subject:

An update on the first three years of progress (2018 to 2020) on the Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) program, which rewards Bay Area jurisdictions that produce or preserve the most affordable housing over a five-year period. Housing progress for the remaining two years, 2021 and 2022, will be reflected in future HIP program reporting as data becomes available.

Background:

In October 2018, the Commission established the criteria for the \$76 million HIP program (MTC Resolution No. 4348), comprised of \$46 million in regionally-controlled Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds and \$30 million in One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) program funds. The Commission directed \$5 million of the program total for the Sub-HIP pilot program in the North Bay, which was programmed to various transportation projects in Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties in July 2020. This agenda item focuses on the status of the larger, \$71 million HIP program that remains unprogrammed.

Staff presented the HIP program progress report to May 2022 joint meeting of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Housing Committee/Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA) Oversight Committee. This information is included in the Committee's agenda this month for information.

HIP Program Overview

Established as a "race to the top" incentive, the HIP program will award transportation funds on a per-unit basis to the 15 jurisdictions that produce or preserve the greatest number of affordable housing units from 2018 through 2022. To be eligible for funding, jurisdictions must comply with state housing laws for Surplus Lands, Accessory Dwelling Units, Density Bonuses, and Housing Elements.

To qualify for HIP credit, housing units must be affordable, deed-restricted, and located within Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). Credit for preservation will be awarded for multi-family units that are either (a) newly acquired and protected as affordable, or (b) existing government-assisted units, with a high risk of converting to market-

rate housing, which are given extended protections. For further detail on HIP criteria, see **Attachment 1**.

HIP Status Report

This update incorporates 2020 production and preservation data into ongoing HIP program standings by jurisdiction. In 2020 alone, Bay Area PDAs and TPAs saw over 1,800 new affordable units added and an additional 350 units preserved. Since the beginning of the five-year program, from 2018 to 2020, jurisdictions have built or preserved more than 5,800 affordable units in PDAs or TPAs. Nearly half (46%) of the qualifying units in that period were located in San Francisco. When including the next four cities – Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, and Daly City – the top 5 jurisdictions account for producing or preserving two-thirds of the total qualifying HIP units. A detailed list of HIP program standings by jurisdiction is included in **Attachment 1**. Please note that the current standings do not imply a funding commitment; HIP program awards will not be determined until the full five years of housing data have been compiled.

To illustrate the targeted focus of the HIP program, the units built from 2018 to 2020 that qualify for HIP comprise only a fraction (9%) of the total housing built in that time. **Attachment 2** lists the total number of housing units built in each jurisdiction from 2018 to 2020 – including all levels of affordability, deed restriction status, and relationship to PDAs and/or TPAs.

Issues:

- Data for new units is derived from the Housing Element Annual Progress Reports submitted by jurisdictions to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Data for preserved units are provided by California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC), who review annual Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) affordable housing development reports to identify qualifying preserved units. In the 2018-2019 HIP progress report, staff reflected qualifying preserved units in the year that loan funds were awarded. With the 2020 update, units for all years are now categorized by the year of loan closure to more closely align with the certificate of occupancy dates for new units. Staff encourages jurisdictions to review the housing data presented in **Attachment 1** and **Attachment 2** and alert MTC staff to any corrections that are needed in the number or categorization of units. Additional updates and corrections to

both new unit and preserved unit data may be provided in future progress reports. HIP unit data will be considered draft until the program awards are finalized after 2022.

- In 2017, the Commission committed the \$46 million in regionally-controlled RTIP funds first as contingency for the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP), and, if not needed, to augment the \$30 million from OBAG 2 programmed to the HIP program. Staff are still monitoring the PCEP project, but based on current information from the project sponsor, do not believe that the partners, including MTC, will be asked to contribute additional funding to complete the project. If that changes, this may reduce or eliminate the RTIP funds available for the HIP program.

Recommendation:

Information Only

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: HIP Program Status Report (2018-20)
- Attachment 2: All New Housing Units (2018-20)



Therese W. McMillan

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Status Report: 2018 to 2020

Current Rank	Jurisdiction	2018 New	2018 Preserved	2018 Total	2019 New	2019 Preserved	2019 Total	2020 New	2020 Preserved	2020 Total	Total New	Total Preserved	Total Units
1	San Francisco	504	50	554	1,279	95	1,374	689	51	740	2,472	196	2,668
2	Oakland	39	56	95	4	66	70	183	235	418	226	357	583
3	San Jose	-	-	-	215	-	215	99	-	99	314	-	314
4	Fremont	1	-	1	100	-	100	121	-	121	222	-	222
5	Daly City	3	-	3	-	-	-	210	-	210	213	-	213
6	Sunnyvale	57	-	57	91	23	114	41	-	41	189	23	212
7	Mountain View	16	-	16	67	-	67	114	-	114	197	-	197
8	San Mateo	16	-	16	7	-	7	116	-	116	139	-	139
9	Livermore	-	-	-	72	-	72	34	-	34	106	-	106
10	Walnut Creek	58	-	58	-	-	-	45	-	45	103	-	103
11	Emeryville	1	-	1	77	-	77	15	-	15	93	-	93
12	South San Francisco	1	-	1	81	-	81	-	-	-	82	-	82
13	Concord	-	-	-	-	79	79	-	-	-	-	79	79
13	Santa Rosa	79	-	79	-	-	-	-	-	-	79	-	79
15	El Cerrito	15	-	15	62	-	62	-	-	-	77	-	77
16	Oakley	-	-	-	74	-	74	-	-	-	74	-	74
17	Morgan Hill	3	-	3	25	-	25	41	-	41	69	-	69
17	American Canyon	-	-	-	69	-	69	-	-	-	69	-	69
19	Hayward	-	-	-	-	62	62	4	-	4	4	62	66
20	Fairfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	64	-	64	64
21	Pleasanton	33	-	33	-	-	-	30	-	30	63	-	63
22	Alameda	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	-	59	59	-	59
23	Redwood City	-	-	-	7	47	54	-	-	-	7	47	54
24	Berkeley	13	-	13	-	8	8	22	-	22	35	8	43
25	Contra Costa County	-	-	-	42	-	42	-	-	-	42	-	42
26	Campbell	18	-	18	5	-	5	-	-	-	23	-	23
27	Santa Clara	7	-	7	-	-	-	8	-	8	15	-	15
28	Novato	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	9	9	-	9
29	Lafayette	7	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7
30	Menlo Park	-	-	-	3	-	3	2	-	2	5	-	5
31	San Rafael	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	2
32	Pittsburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1
32	Los Gatos	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
All	Total	872	106	978	2,280	380	2,660	1,845	350	2,195	4,997	836	5,833

Current rankings are shown for informational purposes only, and do not imply or guarantee a funding award. All data is considered provisional, and may be subject to change as updates are provided. Final rankings and funding awards will not be determined until after 2022. Only jurisdictions with at least one qualifying HIP unit between 2018 and 2020 are shown.

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Unit Qualifying Criteria

- The HIP program compiles eligible units from 2018 through 2022.
- Newly built or preserved units must be affordable to households at the very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels.
- Newly built or preserved units must be located in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).
- Newly built or preserved units must be deed-restricted.
- Newly built units are measured by certificates of occupancy submitted to California Department of Housing and Community Development through a jurisdiction's Housing Element Annual Progress Report.
- Preserved units must be: (1) Multi-family units that receive governmental assistance consistent with the funding sources in Government Code Section 65863.10(a)(3) that are identified as "very-high risk" or "high risk" of converting to market-rate rents by the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC); or (2) The acquisition/preservation of existing unrestricted multi-family affordable housing units upon which restrictions are newly placed.
- A preserved unit that has deed restrictions for at least 55 years will be counted as one HIP unit. Units with deed restrictions for a shorter duration will receive a pro-rated share of one unit based on the 55-year standard.

Alameda County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Alameda County	-	69	-	187	256
Alameda	31	28	-	54	113
Albany	-	-	21	-	21
Berkeley	35	-	-	645	680
Dublin	-	-	38	1,938	1,976
Emeryville	47	28	18	265	358
Fremont	159	118	24	1,571	1,872
Hayward	-	-	26	737	763
Livermore	106	11	64	580	761
Newark	-	-	-	779	779
Oakland	193	33	1	4,391	4,618
Piedmont	2	9	10	19	40
Pleasanton	84	47	28	515	674
San Leandro	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	6	494	500
Alameda County Total	657	343	236	12,175	13,411
Share of County Total	5%	3%	2%	91%	100%
Share of Regional Total	20%	11%	9%	28%	25%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Alameda County	-	24	-	11	5
Alameda	31	28	-	44	103
Albany	-	-	13	-	13
Berkeley	35	-	-	537	572
Dublin	-	-	-	841	841
Emeryville	47	28	18	265	358
Fremont	124	74	24	1,059	1,281
Hayward	-	-	8	308	316
Livermore	106	-	11	371	488
Newark	-	-	-	508	508
Oakland	193	33	1	4,157	4,384
Piedmont	-	1	-	-	1
Pleasanton	52	11	3	238	304
San Leandro	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	2	489	491
Alameda County	588	199	80	8,828	9,695
Share of County Total	6%	2%	1%	91%	100%
Share of Regional Total	22%	10%	7%	30%	28%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Alameda County	-	-	-	-
Alameda	31	28	-	59
Albany	-	-	-	-
Berkeley	35	-	-	35
Dublin	-	-	-	-
Emeryville	47	28	18	93
Fremont	124	74	24	222
Hayward	-	-	4	4
Livermore	106	-	-	106
Newark	-	-	-	-
Oakland	193	33	-	226
Piedmont	-	-	-	-
Pleasanton	52	11	-	63
San Leandro	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	-	-
Alameda County	588	174	46	808
Share of County Total	73%	22%	6%	100%
Share of Regional Total	22%	10%	9%	16%

Contra Costa County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Antioch	85	2	50	397	534
Brentwood	-	-	6	166	172
Clayton	-	2	-	-	2
Concord	-	-	1	113	114
Contra Costa County	42	2	2	1,074	1,120
Danville	-	18	15	92	125
El Cerrito	62	5	10	105	182
Hercules	-	-	-	259	259
Lafayette	-	1	25	128	154
Martinez	-	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	4	60	64
Oakley	-	74	-	581	655
Orinda	-	-	13	127	140
Pinole	-	-	-	6	6
Pittsburg	23	207	66	92	388
Pleasant Hill	-	-	13	66	79
Richmond	-	-	-	343	343
San Pablo	-	3	5	7	15
San Ramon	22	84	162	708	976
Walnut Creek	94	16	22	526	658
Contra Costa County Total	328	414	394	4,850	5,986
Share of County Total	5%	7%	7%	81%	100%
Share of Regional Total	10%	14%	15%	11%	11%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Antioch	-	-	18	36	54
Brentwood	-	-	-	-	-
Clayton	-	-	-	-	-
Concord	-	-	-	11	11
Contra Costa County	42	-	-	457	499
Danville	-	-	-	-	-
El Cerrito	62	5	10	90	167
Hercules	-	-	-	258	258
Lafayette	-	-	10	76	86
Martinez	-	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	-	31	31
Oakley	-	74	-	1	75
Orinda	-	-	-	-	-
Pinole	-	-	-	4	4
Pittsburg	-	1	2	6	9
Pleasant Hill	-	-	5	43	48
Richmond	-	-	-	237	237
San Pablo	-	2	2	1	5
San Ramon	-	-	-	-	-
Walnut Creek	94	11	1	420	526
Contra Costa County	198	93	48	1,671	2,010
Share of County Total	10%	5%	2%	83%	100%
Share of Regional Total	7%	5%	4%	6%	6%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	VeryLow	Low	Moderate	Total
Antioch	-	-	-	-
Brentwood	-	-	-	-
Clayton	-	-	-	-
Concord	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa County	42	-	-	42
Danville	-	-	-	-
El Cerrito	62	5	10	77
Hercules	-	-	-	-
Lafayette	-	-	7	7
Martinez	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	-	-
Oakley	-	74	-	74
Orinda	-	-	-	-
Pinole	-	-	-	-
Pittsburg	-	1	-	1
Pleasant Hill	-	-	-	-
Richmond	-	-	-	-
San Pablo	-	-	-	-
San Ramon	-	-	-	-
Walnut Creek	94	8	1	103
Contra Costa County	198	88	18	304
Share of County Total	65%	29%	6%	100%
Share of Regional Total	7%	5%	3%	6%

Marin County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Belvedere	-	-	-	-	-
Corte Madera	7	1	5	16	29
Fairfax	18	45	3	1	67
Larkspur	2	-	-	4	6
Marin County	7	1	-	61	69
Mill Valley	3	3	5	4	15
Novato	18	8	-	136	162
Ross	4	2	2	2	10
San Anselmo	1	2	7	10	20
San Rafael	1	45	6	65	117
Sausalito	-	3	5	2	10
Tiburon	-	-	1	5	6
Marin County Total	61	110	34	306	511
Share of County Total	12%	22%	7%	60%	100%
Share of Regional Total	2%	4%	1%	1%	1%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Belvedere	-	-	-	-	-
Corte Madera	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfax	-	-	-	-	-
Larkspur	-	-	-	3	3
Marin County	-	-	-	-	-
Mill Valley	-	-	-	-	-
Novato	6	4	-	51	61
Ross	-	-	-	-	-
San Anselmo	-	-	-	-	-
San Rafael	1	11	-	13	25
Sausalito	-	2	3	-	5
Tiburon	-	-	-	-	-
Marin County	7	17	3	67	94
Share of County Total	7%	18%	3%	71%	100%
Share of Regional Total	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Belvedere	-	-	-	-
Corte Madera	-	-	-	-
Fairfax	-	-	-	-
Larkspur	-	-	-	-
Marin County	-	-	-	-
Mill Valley	-	-	-	-
Novato	5	4	-	9
Ross	-	-	-	-
San Anselmo	-	-	-	-
San Rafael	1	1	-	2
Sausalito	-	-	-	-
Tiburon	-	-	-	-
Marin County	6	5	-	11
Share of County Total	0%	0%	0%	0%
Share of Regional Total	0%	0%	0%	0%

Napa County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
American Canyon	51	21	1	1	74
Calistoga	23	9	4	13	49
Napa	-	12	12	111	135
Napa County	-	-	1	2	3
Saint Helena	-	-	-	25	25
Yountville	-	-	5	3	8
Napa County Total	74	42	23	155	294
Share of County Total	25%	14%	8%	53%	100%
Share of Regional Total	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
American Canyon	49	20	-	1	70
Calistoga	-	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Helena	-	-	-	-	-
Yountville	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	49	20	-	1	70
Share of County Total	70%	29%	0%	1%	100%
Share of Regional Total	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
American Canyon	49	20	-	69
Calistoga	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	-	-	-
Napa County	-	-	-	-
Saint Helena	-	-	-	-
Yountville	-	-	-	-
Napa County	49	20	-	69
Share of County Total	71%	29%	0%	100%
Share of Regional Total	2%	1%	0%	1%

San Francisco County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
San Francisco	1,039	1,075	771	8,882	11,767
San Francisco County Total	1,039	1,075	771	8,882	11,767
Share of County Total	9%	9%	7%	75%	100%
Share of Regional Total	31%	36%	29%	20%	22%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
San Francisco	1,039	1,075	766	8,872	11,752
San Francisco County	1,039	1,075	766	8,872	11,752
Share of County Total	9%	9%	7%	75%	100%
Share of Regional Total	39%	56%	64%	30%	34%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
San Francisco	1,039	1,075	358	2,472
San Francisco County	1,039	1,075	358	2,472
Share of County Total	42%	43%	14%	100%
Share of Regional Total	39%	59%	69%	49%

San Mateo County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Atherton	5	2	3	40	50
Belmont	-	-	18	42	60
Brisbane	-	-	10	13	23
Burlingame	-	-	-	37	37
Colma	-	-	-	8	8
Daly City	20	255	105	169	549
East Palo Alto	3	3	3	1	10
Foster City	11	31	9	290	341
Half Moon Bay	-	-	18	47	65
Hillsborough	3	1	-	-	4
Menlo Park	29	26	2	331	388
Millbrae	1	3	-	8	12
Pacifica	-	-	-	29	29
Portola Valley	10	1	3	9	23
Redwood City	7	53	-	634	694
San Bruno	-	15	-	92	107
San Carlos	-	-	-	27	27
San Mateo	118	20	4	805	947
San Mateo County	7	45	52	190	294
South San Francisco	81	-	47	333	461
Woodside	4	1	1	27	33
San Mateo County Total	299	456	275	3,132	4,162
Share of County Total	7%	11%	7%	75%	100%
Share of Regional Total	9%	15%	10%	7%	8%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Atherton	3	1	-	9	13
Belmont	-	-	4	34	38
Brisbane	-	-	-	-	-
Burlingame	-	-	-	33	33
Colma	-	-	-	8	8
Daly City	20	209	42	123	394
East Palo Alto	-	1	1	-	2
Foster City	-	-	-	-	-
Half Moon Bay	-	-	-	-	-
Hillsborough	-	-	-	-	-
Menlo Park	2	5	2	51	60
Millbrae	-	-	-	3	3
Pacifica	-	-	-	3	3
Portola Valley	-	-	-	-	-
Redwood City	7	6	-	622	635
San Bruno	-	3	-	83	86
San Carlos	-	-	-	13	13
San Mateo	118	20	1	721	860
San Mateo County	-	4	21	19	44
South San Francisco	81	-	17	326	424
Woodside	-	-	-	-	-
San Mateo County	231	249	88	2,048	2,616
Share of County Total	9%	10%	3%	78%	100%
Share of Regional Total	9%	13%	7%	7%	7%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Atherton	-	-	-	-
Belmont	-	-	-	-
Brisbane	-	-	-	-
Burlingame	-	-	-	-
Colma	-	-	-	-
Daly City	20	186	7	213
East Palo Alto	-	-	-	-
Foster City	-	-	-	-
Half Moon Bay	-	-	-	-
Hillsborough	-	-	-	-
Menlo Park	-	3	2	5
Millbrae	-	-	-	-
Pacifica	-	-	-	-
Portola Valley	-	-	-	-
Redwood City	7	-	-	7
San Bruno	-	-	-	-
San Carlos	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	118	20	1	139
San Mateo County	-	-	-	-
South San Francisco	81	-	1	82
Woodside	-	-	-	-
San Mateo County	226	209	11	446
Share of County Total	51%	47%	2%	100%
Share of Regional Total	8%	11%	2%	9%

Santa Clara County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Campbell	11	2	10	302	325
Cupertino	-	-	-	-	-
Gilroy	-	-	13	211	224
Los Altos	-	-	-	2	2
Los Altos Hills	13	8	4	50	75
Los Gatos	-	-	43	24	67
Milpitas	-	-	-	1,178	1,178
Monte Sereno	19	-	1	7	27
Morgan Hill	72	55	353	633	1,113
Mountain View	66	245	-	1,826	2,137
Palo Alto	-	-	-	46	46
San Jose	504	-	-	2,172	2,676
Santa Clara	-	1	15	2,257	2,273
Saratoga	-	2	3	-	5
Sunnyvale	73	59	156	1,266	1,554
Santa Clara County Total	758	372	598	9,974	11,702
Share of County Total	6%	3%	5%	85%	100%
Share of Regional Total	23%	12%	22%	23%	22%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Campbell	11	2	10	251	274
Cupertino	-	-	-	-	-
Gilroy	-	-	2	1	3
Los Altos	-	-	-	-	-
Los Altos Hills	-	-	-	-	-
Los Gatos	-	-	4	6	10
Milpitas	-	-	-	934	934
Monte Sereno	-	-	-	-	-
Morgan Hill	45	21	86	151	303
Mountain View	54	143	-	1,732	1,929
Palo Alto	-	-	-	9	9
San Jose	314	-	-	1,792	2,106
Santa Clara	-	1	14	887	902
Saratoga	-	-	-	-	-
Sunnyvale	73	59	73	1,012	1,217
Santa Clara County	497	226	189	6,775	7,687
Share of County Total	6%	3%	2%	88%	100%
Share of Regional Total	19%	12%	16%	23%	22%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Campbell	11	2	10	23
Cupertino	-	-	-	-
Gilroy	-	-	-	-
Los Altos	-	-	-	-
Los Altos Hills	-	-	-	-
Los Gatos	-	-	1	1
Milpitas	-	-	-	-
Monte Sereno	-	-	-	-
Morgan Hill	45	21	3	69
Mountain View	54	143	-	197
Palo Alto	-	-	-	-
San Jose	314	-	-	314
Santa Clara	-	1	14	15
Saratoga	-	-	-	-
Sunnyvale	73	59	57	189
Santa Clara County	497	226	85	808
Share of County Total	62%	28%	11%	100%
Share of Regional Total	19%	12%	16%	16%

Solano County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Benicia	-	-	3	1	4
Dixon	-	-	23	68	91
Fairfield	-	-	1	697	698
Rio Vista	-	-	3	236	239
Solano County	-	8	1	4	13
Suisun City	-	-	-	11	11
Vacaville	-	40	20	716	776
Vallejo	-	-	-	105	105
Solano County Total	-	48	51	1,838	1,937
Share of County Total	0%	2%	3%	95%	100%
Share of Regional Total	0%	2%	2%	4%	4%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Benicia	-	-	-	-	-
Dixon	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	-	7	7
Rio Vista	-	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	-	-	-
Suisun City	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	-	-	-	245	245
Vallejo	-	-	-	4	4
Solano County	-	-	-	256	256
Share of County Total	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Share of Regional Total	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Benicia	-	-	-	-
Dixon	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	-	-
Rio Vista	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	-	-
Suisun City	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	-	-	-	-
Vallejo	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	-	-
Share of County Total	0%	0%	0%	0%
Share of Regional Total	0%	0%	0%	0%

Sonoma County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Cloverdale	1	1	23	39	64
Cotati	3	4	2	19	28
Healdsburg	-	-	5	-	5
Petaluma	-	-	15	172	187
Rohnert Park	-	3	8	805	816
Santa Rosa	86	40	48	966	1,140
Sebastopol	2	4	2	14	22
Sonoma	-	7	9	27	43
Sonoma County	33	95	175	672	975
Windsor	-	-	-	26	26
Sonoma County Total	125	154	287	2,740	3,306
Share of County Total	4%	5%	9%	83%	100%
Share of Regional Total	4%	5%	11%	6%	6%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Cloverdale	1	-	-	11	12
Cotati	-	2	1	-	3
Healdsburg	-	-	-	-	-
Petaluma	-	-	1	60	61
Rohnert Park	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa	56	23	17	490	586
Sebastopol	-	2	2	6	10
Sonoma	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	24	35	2	71	132
Windsor	-	-	-	4	4
Sonoma County	81	62	23	642	808
Share of County Total	10%	8%	3%	79%	100%
Share of Regional Total	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Cloverdale	-	-	-	-
Cotati	-	-	-	-
Healdsburg	-	-	-	-
Petaluma	-	-	-	-
Rohnert Park	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa	56	23	-	79
Sebastopol	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	-	-	-	-
Windsor	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	56	23	-	79
Share of County Total	0%	0%	0%	0%
Share of Regional Total	2%	1%	0%	2%

Regional Total

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Regional Total	3,341	3,014	2,669	44,052	53,076
Share of Regional Total	6%	6%	5%	83%	100%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Regional Total	2,666	1,906	1,195	29,153	34,920
Share of Regional Total	8%	5%	3%	83%	100%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Regional Total	2,659	1,820	518	4,997
Share of Regional Total	53%	36%	10%	100%

Certificate of occupancy data from California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) from local jurisdictions Housing Element Annual Progress Reports; data compiled and analyzed by MTC staff to confirm spatial relationship with PDAs/TPAs. All data is considered provisional, and may be subject to change as updates are provided. Final rankings and funding awards will not be determined until after 2022.

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Unit Qualifying Criteria

- The HIP program compiles eligible units from 2018 through 2022.
- Newly built or preserved units must be affordable to households at the very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels.
- Newly built or preserved units must be located in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).
- Newly built or preserved units must be deed-restricted.
- Newly built units are measured by certificates of occupancy submitted to California Department of Housing and Community Development through a jurisdiction's Housing Element Annual Progress Report.
- Preserved units must be: (1) Multi-family units that receive governmental assistance consistent with the funding sources in Government Code Section 65863.10(a)(3) that are identified as “very-high risk” or “high risk” of converting to market-rate rents by the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC); or (2) The acquisition/preservation of existing unrestricted multi-family affordable housing units upon which restrictions are newly placed.
- A preserved unit that has deed restrictions for at least 55 years will be counted as one HIP unit. Units with deed restrictions for a shorter duration will receive a pro-rated share of one unit based on the 55-year standard.