



Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
Suite 700
San Francisco, California

Meeting Agenda - Final

ABAG Housing Committee

Vice Chair, Carlos Romero, Councilmember, East Palo Alto

Thursday, May 12, 2022

1:00 PM

REMOTE (In person option available)

**Association of Bay Area Governments
Housing Committee
Joint Meeting with the BAHFA Oversight Committee**

In light of Governor Newsom's State of Emergency declaration regarding COVID-19 and in accordance with Assembly Bill 361's (Rivas) provisions allowing remote meetings, this meeting will be accessible via webcast, teleconference, and Zoom for all participants.

A Zoom panelist link for meeting participants will be sent separately to committee, commission, or board members.

The meeting webcast will be available at: <https://abag.ca.gov/meetings-events/live-webcasts>

Meeting attendees may opt to attend in person for public comment and observation at 375 Beale Street, Board Room (1st Floor).

In-person attendees must adhere to posted public health protocols while in the building.

Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely via Zoom at the following link or phone number:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://bayareametro.zoom.us/j/85195052357>

Or One tap mobile :

US: +13462487799,,85195052357# or +14086380968,,85195052357#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 408 638 0968 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 876 9923 or +1 301 715 8592 or 888 788 0099 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0276 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0282 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5247 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 851 9505 2357

Detailed instructions on participating via Zoom are available at:

<https://abag.ca.gov/zoom-information>

Committee members and members of the public participating by Zoom wishing to speak should use the "raise hand" feature or dial "*"9".

In order to get the full Zoom experience, please make sure your application is up to date.

Members of the public may participate by phone or Zoom or may submit comments by email at info@bayareametro.gov by 5:00 p.m. the day before the scheduled meeting date. Please

include the committee or board meeting name in the subject line. Due to the current circumstances, there may be limited opportunity to address comments during the meeting. All comments received will be submitted into the record.

The ABAG Housing Committee may act on any item on the agenda.

The meeting is scheduled to begin at 1:00 p.m.

Agenda, roster, and webcast available at <https://abag.ca.gov>

For information, contact Clerk of the Board at (415) 820-7913.

Roster

Jesse Arreguin, Nikki Fortunato Bas, David Canepa, Pat Eklund,
Maya Esparza, Neysa Fligor, Gordon Mar, Karen Mitchoff, Belia Ramos,
Carlos Romero, James Spering

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Confirm Quorum / Compensation Announcement

Quorum is a majority of members present.

2. Public Comment

Information

3. ABAG Housing Committee Election of Chair and Vice Chair

- 3.a. [22-0846](#) Election of ABAG Housing Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Action: ABAG Housing Committee Approval

Presenter: Clerk of the Board

Attachments: [03a Summary Sheet Election Housing Chair Vice Chair.pdf](#)

4. Committee Member Announcements

Information

5. Chairs' Report

- 5.a. [22-0703](#) ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee Chairs' Report for May 12, 2022

Action: ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information

Presenter: Carlos Romero
Libby Schaaf

6. Executive Director's Report

- 6.a. [22-0704](#) Executive Director's Report for May 12, 2022

Action: ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information

Presenter: Therese W. McMillan

7. ABAG Housing Committee Consent Calendar

- 7.a. [22-0705](#) Approval of ABAG Housing Committee Minutes of April 14, 2022

Action: ABAG Housing Committee Approval

Presenter: Clerk of the Board

Attachments: [07a HC Minutes 20220414 Draft.pdf](#)

8. BAHFA Oversight Committee Consent Calendar

- 8.a. [22-0706](#) Approval of BAHFA Oversight Committee Minutes of April 14, 2022

Action: BAHFA Oversight Committee Approval

Presenter: Secretary

Attachments: [08a BAHFA OC Minutes 20220414 Draft.pdf](#)

- 8.b. [22-0931](#) Adoption of BAHFA Resolution No. 11 to apply Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution No. 3619 and other MTC rules for administration, employee relations, contracting and other business operations to BAHFA

Action: Approval

Presenter: Kate Hartley

Attachments: [08b 1 Summary BAHFA Adoption of MTC Administration Policies.pdf](#)
[08b 2 Attachment-BAHFA-RES_0011.pdf](#)

9. Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program

- 9.a. [22-0741](#) Update on Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program

Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program update on recent technical assistance to support local jurisdictions with Housing Elements, including status of local REAP suballocations.

Action: ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information

Presenter: Heather Peters

Attachments: [09a 1 Summary Sheet RHTA Update.pdf](#)
[09a 2 Attachment A Summary of Housing Element Review Letters.pdf](#)
[09a 3 Attachment B RHTA first year highlights with TA index.pdf](#)
[09a 4 Attachment C Summary of Local Suballocations.pdf](#)
[09a 5 Attachment D Regional Housing Technical Assistance \(RHTA\) Update Pr](#)

10. Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program

10.a. [22-0740](#) Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Progress Report (2018-20)

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.

Action: ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information

Presenter: Mallory Atkinson

Attachments: [10a 0 HIP Status Update.pdf](#)
[10a 1 HIP Attachment 1.pdf](#)
[10a 2 HIP Attachment 2.pdf](#)

11. Adjournment / Next Meeting

The next joint meeting of the ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee is on June 9, 2022.

Public Comment: The public is encouraged to comment on agenda items at Committee meetings by completing a request-to-speak card (available from staff) and passing it to the Committee secretary. Public comment may be limited by any of the procedures set forth in Section 3.09 of MTC's Procedures Manual (Resolution No. 1058, Revised) if, in the chair's judgment, it is necessary to maintain the orderly flow of business.

Meeting Conduct: If this meeting is willfully interrupted or disrupted by one or more persons rendering orderly conduct of the meeting unfeasible, the Chair may order the removal of individuals who are willfully disrupting the meeting. Such individuals may be arrested. If order cannot be restored by such removal, the members of the Committee may direct that the meeting room be cleared (except for representatives of the press or other news media not participating in the disturbance), and the session may continue.

Record of Meeting: Committee meetings are recorded. Copies of recordings are available at a nominal charge, or recordings may be listened to at MTC offices by appointment. Audiocasts are maintained on MTC's Web site (mtc.ca.gov) for public review for at least one year.

Accessibility and Title VI: MTC provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited-English proficient who wish to address Commission matters. For accommodations or translations assistance, please call 415.778.6757 or 415.778.6769 for TDD/TTY. We require three working days' notice to accommodate your request.

可及性和法令第六章: MTC 根據要求向希望來委員會討論有關事宜的殘疾人士及英語有限者提供服務/方便。需要便利設施或翻譯協助者, 請致電 415.778.6757 或 415.778.6769 TDD / TTY。我們要求您在三個工作日前告知, 以滿足您的要求。

Acceso y el Titulo VI: La MTC puede proveer asistencia/facilitar la comunicación a las personas discapacitadas y los individuos con conocimiento limitado del inglés quienes quieran dirigirse a la Comisión. Para solicitar asistencia, por favor llame al número 415.778.6757 o al 415.778.6769 para TDD/TTY. Requerimos que solicite asistencia con tres días hábiles de anticipación para poderle proveer asistencia.

Attachments are sent to Committee members, key staff and others as appropriate. Copies will be available at the meeting.

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0846 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Report **Status:** Committee Approval
File created: 4/22/2022 **In control:** ABAG Housing Committee
On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**
Title: Election of ABAG Housing Committee Chair and Vice Chair
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments: [03a Summary Sheet Election Housing Chair Vice Chair.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Election of ABAG Housing Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Clerk of the Board

ABAG Housing Committee Approval

Association of Bay Area Governments

Housing Committee

May 12, 2022

Agenda Item 3.a.

Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Subject:

Election of ABAG Housing Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Background:

According to the ABAG Bylaws, Article IX, F.:

The President, subject to the advice and consent of the Executive Board, shall appoint committees and determine the committees' structure, charge, size and membership. Committees may be established to consider any matter within the jurisdiction of the Association. Committees shall operate according to the policies adopted by the Executive Board, and shall submit their reports and recommendations to the Executive Board. Committees shall meet on the call of their chairpersons, who shall be (1) an elected official or the elective or appointive officer of the City and County of San Francisco appointed by the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco to the Executive Board or General Assembly, and (2) a member of such committee; and who shall be elected by the members of each committee. At the initial meeting of each committee, and annually thereafter at the first committee meeting following January 1 of each year, the committees shall elect their chairpersons and such other officers as may be specified. Committee chairpersons shall be subject to confirmation by the Executive Board. Unless otherwise authorized by the Executive Board, committees of the Association shall be advisory.

Issues:

None

Recommended Action:

The ABAG Housing Committee is requested to elect a Chair and Vice Chair.

Attachments:

None

Reviewed:



Therese W. McMillan



ABAG

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0703 **Version:** 1 **Name:**

Type: Report **Status:** Informational

File created: 4/6/2022 **In control:** ABAG Housing Committee

On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**

Title: ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee Chairs' Report for May 12, 2022

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments:

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee Chairs' Report for May 12, 2022

Carlos Romero
Libby Schaaf

ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0704 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Report **Status:** Informational
File created: 4/6/2022 **In control:** ABAG Housing Committee
On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**
Title: Executive Director's Report for May 12, 2022
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments:

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Executive Director's Report for May 12, 2022

Therese W. McMillan

ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0705 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Minutes **Status:** Consent
File created: 4/6/2022 **In control:** ABAG Housing Committee
On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**
Title: Approval of ABAG Housing Committee Minutes of April 14, 2022
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments: [07a HC Minutes 20220414 Draft.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Approval of ABAG Housing Committee Minutes of April 14, 2022

Clerk of the Board

ABAG Housing Committee Approval



Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
Suite 700
San Francisco, California

Meeting Minutes - Draft

ABAG Housing Committee

Vice Chair, Carlos Romero, Councilmember, East Palo Alto

Thursday, April 14, 2022

1:00 PM

REMOTE (In person option available)

**Association of Bay Area Governments
Housing Committee
Joint Meeting with the BAHFA Oversight Committee**

The ABAG Housing Committee may act on any item on the agenda.

The meeting is scheduled to begin at 1:00 p.m.

Agenda, roster, and webcast available at <https://abag.ca.gov>

For information, contact Clerk of the Board at (415) 820-7913.

Roster

**Jesse Arreguin, Nikki Fortunato Bas, David Canepa, Pat Eklund,
Maya Esparza, Gordon Mar, Karen Mitchoff, Belia Ramos, Carlos Romero**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Confirm Quorum / Compensation Announcement

Vice Chair Romero called the meeting to order at about 1:07 p.m. Quorum was present.

Present: 7 - Arreguin, Bas, Canepa, Eklund, Mitchoff, Ramos, and Romero

Absent: 2 - Esparza, and Mar

2. Public Comment

3. Committee Member Announcements

4. Chairs' Report

- 4.a.** [22-0551](#) ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee Chairs' Report for April 14, 2022
- BAHFA Oversight Committee Chair Schaaf and ABAG Housing Committee Vice Chair Romero gave their reports.

5. Executive Director's Report

- 5.a. [22-0552](#) Executive Director's Report for April 14, 2022

Therese McMillan gave the report.

6. ABAG Housing Committee Consent Calendar

Upon the motion by Mitchoff and second by Arreguin, the ABAG Housing Committee approved the ABAG Housing Committee Consent Calendar. The motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Arreguin, Bas, Canepa, Eklund, Mitchoff, Ramos, and Romero

Absent: 2 - Esparza, and Mar

- 6.a. [22-0553](#) Approval of ABAG Housing Committee Minutes of January 24, 2022

7. BAHFA Oversight Committee Consent Calendar

The BAHFA Oversight Committee took action on this item.

- 7.a. [22-0554](#) Approval of BAHFA Oversight Committee Minutes of January 24, 2022

8. State Budget Housing Request

- 8.a. [22-0555](#) Overview of ABAG and MTC's Housing Request for the Fiscal Year 2022-23 State Budget

Georgia Gann Dohrmann gave the report.

The following gave public comment: Bob Allen.

9. BAHFA Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget

- 9.a. [22-0556](#) Adoption of BAHFA's Inaugural Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget, including the \$20 million State Grant

The BAHFA Oversight Committee took action on this item.

Kate Hartley gave the report.

The following gave public comment: Nevada Merriman, J'Nai Aubrey, Amiel Leano Atanacio, Ken Chan, Huascar Castro.

The following submitted public comment: People's Land and Housing Alliance.

10. BAHFA Business Plan Project Timeline

- 10.a. [22-0557](#) Overview of the Process to Develop a Business Plan for BAHFA including Deliverables, Major Milestones, and Timeline

Kate Hartley gave the report.

11. Meeting Schedule 2022

- 11.a. [22-0558](#) Request to Reconsider Frequency of Joint Meetings of the ABAG Housing Committee and Bay Area Housing Finance Authority Oversight Committee for the Remainder of 2022

Upon the motion by Mitchoff and second by Arreguin, the ABAG Housing Committee approved a monthly meeting schedule through 2021. The motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Arreguin, Bas, Canepa, Eklund, Mitchoff, and Romero

Absent: 3 - Esparza, Mar, and Ramos

12. Adjournment / Next Meeting

Vice Chair Romero adjourned the meeting at about 2:54 p.m. The next joint meeting of the ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee is on May 12, 2022.



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0706 **Version:** 1 **Name:**

Type: Minutes **Status:** Consent

File created: 4/6/2022 **In control:** Bay Area Housing Finance Authority Oversight Committee

On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**

Title: Approval of BAHFA Oversight Committee Minutes of April 14, 2022

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [08a BAHFA OC Minutes 20220414 Draft.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Approval of BAHFA Oversight Committee Minutes of April 14, 2022

Secretary

BAHFA Oversight Committee Approval



Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Bay Area Housing Finance Authority Oversight Committee

Chair, Libby Schaaf, Mayor, City of Oakland
Vice Chair, Amy Worth, Mayor, City of Orinda

Thursday, April 14, 2022

1:00 PM

REMOTE (In person option available)

**Bay Area Housing Finance Authority
Oversight Committee
Joint Meeting with the ABAG Housing Committee**

The BAHFA Oversight Committee may act on any item on the agenda.

The meeting is scheduled to begin at 1:00 p.m.

Agenda, roster, and webcast available at <https://mtc.ca.gov/>

For information, contact Clerk of the Board at (415) 820-7913.

Roster

Margaret Abe-Koga, David Canepa, Federal Glover, David Rabbitt,
Hillary Ronen, Libby Schaaf, Amy Worth

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Confirm Quorum / Compensation Announcement

Chair Schaaf called the meeting to order at about 1:07 p.m. Chair Schaaf deputized Alfredo Pedroza and James Spering. Quorum was present.

Present: 8 - Abe-Koga, Canepa, Glover, Pedroza, Ronen, Schaaf, Spering, and Worth

Absent: 1 - Rabbitt

2. Public Comment

3. Committee Member Announcements

4. Chairs' Report

- 4.a. [22-0551](#) ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee Chairs' Report for April 14, 2022
- BAHFA Oversight Committee Chair Schaaf and ABAG Housing Committee Vice Chair Romero gave their reports.

5. Executive Director's Report

- 5.a. [22-0552](#) Executive Director's Report for April 14, 2022

Therese McMillan gave the report.

6. ABAG Housing Committee Consent Calendar

The ABAG Housing Committee took action on this item.

- 6.a. [22-0553](#) Approval of ABAG Housing Committee Minutes of January 24, 2022

7. BAHFA Oversight Committee Consent Calendar

Upon the motion by Worth and second by Abe-Koga, the BAHFA Oversight Committee approved the BAHFA Oversight Committee Consent Calendar. The motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Abe-Koga, Canepa, Glover, Pedroza, Ronen, Schaaf, Spring and Worth

Absent: 1 - Rabbitt

- 7.a. [22-0554](#) Approval of BAHFA Oversight Committee Minutes of January 24, 2022

8. State Budget Housing Request

- 8.a. [22-0555](#) Overview of ABAG and MTC's Housing Request for the Fiscal Year 2022-23 State Budget

Georgia Gann Dohrmann gave the report.

The following gave public comment: Bob Allen.

9. BAHFA Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget

- 9.a. [22-0556](#) Adoption of BAHFA's Inaugural Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget, including the \$20 million State Grant

Kate Hartley gave the report.

The following gave public comment: Nevada Merriman, J'Nai Aubrey, Amiel Leano Atanacio, Ken Chan, Huascar Castro.

The following submitted public comment: People's Land and Housing Alliance.

Upon the motion by Glover and second by Worth, the BAHFA Oversight Committee referred BAHFA Resolution No. 10, adoption of BAHFA's inaugural Fiscal Year 2021-2022 budget, including the \$20 million State Grant, to the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority for approval. The motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Abe-Koga, Canepa, Glover, Pedroza, Ronen, Schaaf, Spring and Worth

Absent: 1 - Rabbitt

10. BAHFA Business Plan Project Timeline

- 10.a. [22-0557](#) Overview of the Process to Develop a Business Plan for BAHFA including Deliverables, Major Milestones, and Timeline
- Kate Hartley gave the report.

11. Meeting Schedule 2022

- 11.a. [22-0559](#) Request to Reconsider Frequency of Joint Meetings of the ABAG Housing Committee and Bay Area Housing Finance Authority Oversight Committee for the Remainder of 2022

Upon the motion by Worth and second by Gloer, the BAHFA Oversight Committee approved a monthly meeting schedule through 2021. The motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Abe-Koga, Canepa, Glover, Pedroza, Schaaf, Spering and Worth

Absent: 2 - Rabbitt and Ronen

12. Adjournment / Next Meeting

Chair Schaaf adjourned the meeting at about 2:54 p.m. The next joint meeting of the ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee is on May 12, 2022.



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0931 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Report **Status:** Consent
File created: 4/29/2022 **In control:** Bay Area Housing Finance Authority Oversight Committee
On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**
Title: Adoption of BAHFA Resolution No. 11 to apply Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution No. 3619 and other MTC rules for administration, employee relations, contracting and other business operations to BAHFA

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [08b 1 Summary BAHFA Adoption of MTC Administration Policies.pdf](#)
[08b 2 Attachment-BAHFA-RES_0011.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Adoption of BAHFA Resolution No. 11 to apply Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution No. 3619 and other MTC rules for administration, employee relations, contracting and other business operations to BAHFA

Kate Hartley

Approval

May 12, 2022

Agenda Item 8.b.

**Bay Area Housing Finance Authority – Establishing Organizational and Administrative
Procedures of the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority**

Subject:

Adoption of BAHFA Resolution No. 11 to apply Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution No. 3619 and other MTC rules for administration, employee relations, contracting and other business operations to the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority

Background:

Title 6.8 of the Government Code, commencing with Government Code Section 64510 (AB 1487, Chiu, October 8, 2019) creates the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA, or the Authority) with jurisdiction extending throughout the San Francisco Bay Area and provides that BAHFA shall be governed by the same board that governs the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

Per Government Code Section 64514, the BAHFA board may make and enforce rules and regulations necessary for governing the Authority and may act by resolution.

The proposed BAHFA Resolution No. 11 would apply MTC Resolution No. 3619 and other MTC rules, as they exist and as they may be amended, for administration, personnel, payroll, employee relations, purchasing, contracting and other business operations to BAHFA, unless there is a conflict between a MTC rule and a BAHFA rule, in which case, the BAHFA rule shall apply and control.

BAHFA Resolution No. 11 also sets forth BAHFA's agreement to make direct payments on, or reimburse MTC for costs associated with, contracts that directly benefit BAHFA, such as contracts necessary to secure professional services to assist BAHFA in fulfilling its purpose as set forth in Government Code section 64510(c) and related sections of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Housing Finance Act (Gov. Code, sec. 64500, et seq.), as it exists and as it may be amended. The MTC Executive Director or designee is authorized to make such payments on BAHFA's behalf to MTC, including payments for costs that were incurred before the date of this Resolution, provided the costs were incurred in fiscal year 2021-22.

Issues:

None

Recommended Action:

The BAHFA Oversight Committee is requested to refer BAHFA Resolution No. 11 to the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority for adoption.

Attachment:

BAHFA Resolution No. 11

Reviewed:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Therese W. McMillan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Therese W. McMillan

Date: May 25, 2022
W.I.: XXXX

Approved FY 1997–98 Res. Format

ABSTRACT

BAHFA Resolution No. 11

This resolution defines certain organizational and administrative procedures for the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA).

Further discussion of this action is contained in the BAHFA Summary Sheet dated May 12, 2022, included below as Attachment A.

Date: May 25, 2022
W.I.: XXXX

RE: Establishing Organizational and Administrative Procedures of the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority Structure

BAY AREA HOUSING FINANCE AUTHORITY
RESOLUTION NO. 11

WHEREAS, Title 6.8 of the Government Code, commencing with Government Code Section 64510 (AB 1487, Chiu, October 8, 2019) creates the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA, or the Authority) with jurisdiction extending throughout the San Francisco Bay Area and provides that BAHFA shall be governed by the same board that governs the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC); and

WHEREAS, per Government Code Section 64510(c), the Authority's purpose is to raise, administer, and allocate funding and provide technical assistance at a regional level for tenant protection, affordable housing preservation, and new affordable housing production; and

WHEREAS, per Government Code Section 64514, the BAHFA board may make and enforce rules and regulations necessary for governing the Authority, and may act by resolution; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2020, in adopting Resolution No. 1, the BAHFA Board resolved, among other things, 1) to use Metropolitan MTC staff and the MTC committee structure to assist it in performing its statutory responsibilities; 2) to adopt the MTC Commission Procedures Manual as the Authority's manual; and 3) to adopt the MTC Conflict of Interest Code as the Authority's conflict of interest code; and

WHEREAS, BAHFA now seeks to further clarify its operational and administrative procedures; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that BAHFA finds that the foregoing recitals are true and correct; and be it further

RESOLVED, MTC Resolution No. 3619 and other MTC rules, as they exist and as they may be amended, for administration, personnel, payroll, employee relations, purchasing,

contracting and other business operations shall apply to BAHFA, unless there is a conflict between a MTC rule and a BAHFA rule, in which case, the BAHFA rule shall apply and control; and be it further

RESOLVED, beginning in fiscal year 2021-22, BAHFA hereby agrees to reimburse MTC for costs associated with or to make direct payments on contracts that directly benefit BAHFA, in the discretion of the MTC Executive Director or designee, such as contracts necessary to secure professional services to assist BAHFA in fulfilling its purpose as set forth in Government Code section 64510(c) and related sections of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Housing Finance Act (Gov. Code, sec. 64500, et seq.), as it exists and as it may be amended. The MTC Executive Director or designee is authorized to make such payments on BAHFA's behalf to MTC, including payments for costs that were incurred before the date of this Resolution, provided the costs were incurred in fiscal year 2021-22.

RESOLVED, that the officers and agents of BAHFA are hereby authorized and directed to take all further actions necessary and convenient to carry out the purposes of this resolution and that all actions heretofore taken by the officers and agents of BAHFA with respect to the convening of BAHFA are hereby acknowledged, ratified, and approved.

BAY AREA HOUSING FINANCE AUTHORITY

Alfredo Pedroza, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority at a duly called and noticed meeting held in San Francisco, California and at other remote locations, on May 25, 2020.

Date: XXXXX
W.I.: XXXX

Attachment A: Summary Sheet, May 12, 2022
BAHFA Resolution No. 11
Page 1 of 1



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0741 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Report **Status:** Informational
File created: 4/7/2022 **In control:** ABAG Housing Committee
On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**
Title: Update on Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program

Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program update on recent technical assistance to support local jurisdictions with Housing Elements, including status of local REAP suballocations.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [09a 1 Summary Sheet RHTA Update.pdf](#)
[09a 2 Attachment A Summary of Housing Element Review Letters.pdf](#)
[09a 3 Attachment B RHTA first year highlights with TA index.pdf](#)
[09a 4 Attachment C Summary of Local Suballocations.pdf](#)
[09a 5 Attachment D Regional Housing Technical Assistance \(RHTA\) Update Presentation.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

Update on Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program

Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program update on recent technical assistance to support local jurisdictions with Housing Elements, including status of local REAP suballocations.

Heather Peters

ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information

May 12, 2022

Agenda Item 9 a.

Update on Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program

Subject:

Regional Housing Technical Assistance Program update on recent technical assistance to support local jurisdictions with Housing Elements, including status of local Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Suballocations

Discussion:

Staff will present an analysis of a sample of 33 Housing Element compliance letters issued by California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to a variety of jurisdictions in other regions. HCD's comments varied based on local conditions, but there are clear patterns. The biggest problems for other jurisdictions included Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)(94%), sites inventory (94%), and insufficient public engagement (67%). HCD has repeatedly found that draft Housing Elements are not sufficiently detailed and specific with respect to the required data and analyses, and also failed to connect those findings with specific sites strategies and programs and policies.

HCD has been particularly critical of reliance on "ongoing policies and programs" or pledges of future studies without clear timelines and metrics to evaluate success. More detail on HCD's compliance letters and staff's recommendations can be found in Attachment A. ABAG has also developed extensive technical assistance on each of these topics. Additionally, if desired, the Subregional Planning Collaboratives can utilize their REAP funding to have technical assistance providers review drafts of Housing Elements against HCD's checklist to flag potential issues prior to submission to HCD.

Staff will provide a briefing on housing element deadlines and consequences for non-compliance including:

- Fines & regulatory enforcement actions
- Lawsuits from private parties
- Accelerated rezoning deadline
- Loss of eligibility for variety of state and regional funding sources

Staff will also provide an update on the Regional Housing Technical Assistance (RHTA) Program to support local jurisdictions with Housing Elements and other housing topics. Recent technical assistance includes suites of products to assist local jurisdictions to implement new laws relating to lot splits and duplexes (SB 9) as well as affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) (AB 686). Additionally, recent enhancements have been made to the Housing Element Site Selection tool (HESS) including a module to help estimate realistic capacity for development at the parcel level and more detailed mapping of AFFH data points prioritized by

HCD. ABAG is also providing more support for local outreach, including translation services and communications guidance. More details on all technical assistance with links to resources can be found in Attachment B.

Staff will also give an update on the status of \$10.88M in suballocations of REAP funding to all 109 local Bay Area jurisdictions and to the Subregional Planning Collaboratives. Notification of these awards was sent in July of 2021 followed by reminders at Planning Directors meetings, Subregional Collaboratives and targeted outreach to local staff. As of April 18, 2022, 68 local jurisdictions and all of the Collaboratives are in the process of accessing their funds totaling \$9.3 million. Of these, 31 have had their contracts approved, 14 drafts are in review and 23 are in conversation. More details are provided in Attachment C, including the amounts of each suballocation. Spend-down of local suballocations in the REAP program is a statewide concern. By statute all REAP funds must be spent by December 31, 2023, and funds must be returned to the state if not spent. ABAG staff will continue to work with jurisdictions to encourage and facilitate their access to funds. If jurisdictions are unable or unwilling to access funds, staff will return to the Committee with a proposal to reallocate funds for expenditure by the deadline.

Issues:

None

Recommended Action:

Information

Attachments:

- A. Summary of Housing Element Review Letters
- B. RHTA First Year Highlights with TA Index
- C. Summary of Local Suballocations
- D. Regional Housing Technical Assistance (RHTA) Update Presentation

Reviewed:



Therese W. McMillan



Association of Bay Area Governments



Technical Assistance
for Local Planning
HOUSING

Summary of Housing Element Review Letters

Learning from Southern California & Sacramento

In Winter/Spring 2022, ABAG staff and consultants reviewed 33 comment letters from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to jurisdictions in regions with earlier Housing Element deadlines. This summary presents common themes and lessons for Bay Area jurisdictions as they prepare their 6th cycle Housing Elements.

Methodology

Staff and consultants identified a subset of 33 representative comment letters from jurisdictions in the SCAG (Southern California), SACOG (Sacramento) and SANDAG (San Diego) regions. Letters were selected to reflect a diversity of jurisdiction types by geography, size, and socioeconomic characteristics, including racial and ethnic diversity. Staff analyzed both the frequency of comments by Housing Element section and compiled both common and unique comments by major section.

Key Findings and Recommendations

Many assumptions that jurisdictions made in previous Housing Elements will not be possible this cycle. Local jurisdictions will want to ensure that their Housing Elements are thorough, with more robust descriptions of housing needs, more inclusive outreach, a stronger focus on fair housing, more specific policies and programs, and strong justification for sites included in the inventory.

Although the types of comments received by each jurisdiction varied based on their particular demographic and economic characteristics and planning contexts, the most frequent comments can be grouped into five major categories (including the percentage of letters that contained comments on each topic):

- Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH) (94%);
- Public Participation (67%);
- Sites Inventory (94%);
- Government Constraints (58%);
- Policies and Programs (55%).

In addition, a cross-cutting theme is noted below in terms of special needs populations. Finally, unique and recent comments from HCD review letters are presented that may have special relevance for Bay Area jurisdictions.

1. AFFH

Observation

A common theme in the comments across ninety-four percent of the HCD review letters is that the draft Housing Elements are not sufficiently detailed and specific with respect to the required data and analyses for AFFH, and also fail to connect findings from the AFFH analysis with specific sites strategies and programs and policies.

Recommendations

- 1) Review the recommendations and observations contained in the ABAG memo from March 2022, which can be found [here](#) and take advantage of ABAG's other AFFH [technical assistance](#) which can be found [here](#).
- 2) Ensure that the AFFH analyses are sufficiently detailed in terms of required data and maps and include local knowledge and other relevant factors to address State guidelines. Additionally, have a summary narrative that tells the story of the community: how it has changed over time and what the landscape is like today.
- 3) Connect findings from the AFFH analysis to proposed affordable housing programs and policies. It is not enough to just discuss the data, cities must show how they intend to advance fair housing.
- 4) Document how the jurisdiction considered AFFH when initially deciding on sites to include by describing the jurisdiction's process and considerations.

2. Public Participation

Observation

Sixty-seven percent of the letters contained comments concerning inadequate public outreach, almost always connected with the need to demonstrate that outreach was conducted to both lower-income households and households with special needs.

Recommendations

- 1) Ensure robust outreach to lower-income and special needs groups and meetings should include special focus on lower-income or special needs groups.
- 2) Connect the community input received through outreach activities to policies and programs. There should be clear text that summarizes the feedback from the community and how the suggestions were or were not incorporated into the Housing Element.

- 3) Take advantage of ABAG’s technical assistance on public participation including messaging guides, a Multi-lingual Community Survey Template & Social Media Toolkit and translation services which can be found [here](#).

3. Sites Inventory

Observation

All but two jurisdictions in this analysis received one or more comments on the sites inventory section, with the most common and extensive comments falling under two major subcategories: realistic capacity (73%) and non-vacant sites (65%). A frequent type of comment from HCD regarding these sections was that jurisdictions did not provide sufficiently detailed analysis to demonstrate that the proposed sites would develop with the proposed number of housing units during the planning period.

Recommendations

- 1) Follow HCD’s detailed guidance (provided in their memo of June 10, 2020, which can be found [here](#)) and provide specific, site-level analyses to demonstrate that proposed housing sites could actually accommodate the proposed number of housing units by income-level during the planning period. This includes analysis for realistic capacity calculations as well as for development on non-vacant sites that allow other uses in addition to residential uses.
- 2) Use ABAG’s free Housing Element Site Selection (HESS) tool to:
 - a. view HCD’s data points, including AFFH data points, at the parcel level;
 - b. see estimations of realistic development capacity of each parcel given local market trends; and
 - c. automatically complete much of HCD’s required electronic sites inventory form.
- 3) For non-vacant sites, most jurisdictions will need to provide evidence that the existing use is not a barrier to redevelopment with both site specific analysis and a summary of development trends. Additionally, jurisdictions should summarize policies and programs that support residential development on proposed redevelopment sites.
- 4) Assumptions that sites that allow both residential and commercial will include residential need to be supported by evidence. If sites permit developers to choose office or other non-residential uses, it is important to analyze what percentage of applicants are likely to choose non-residential (based on market trends and experience on nearby or similar sites) and reduce unit assumptions accordingly.

4. Governmental Constraints

Observation

Fifty-five percent of letters included comments related to governmental constraints on housing production, frequently including comments on constraints to housing development for lower-income and special needs households.

Recommendations

- 1) Data alone is not sufficient. Provide an analysis of what is or is not a constraint for both market-rate and affordable projects. If there are constraints, identify policies and programs to address those constraints. Jurisdictions should explicitly document and analyze governmental constraints to housing production for lower-income and special needs households and include detailed policies and programs to address such constraints, with clear timelines, milestones, responsible parties and funding.

Policies and Programs

Observation

Many jurisdictions received comments asking for more specificity in their policies and programs section. Generally, a program to study an issue will receive a comment asking for more concrete actions. Vague language will likely be rejected, especially if a program is tied to a constraint.

Recommendations

- 1) Review all programs to ensure that there are clear timelines and metrics to evaluate success. Pay close attention to “ongoing” programs, which may need to be modified to include clear, accountable steps.
- 2) Have a narrative that summarizes key new policies and programs, and connects them to needs, community feedback or constraints.

5. Special Needs Populations

Observation

Across every section included in this analysis, HCD reviewers commented on the lack of sufficient attention to special needs populations (e.g., the elderly, persons with disabilities, large households, female-headed households, farmworkers, and persons experiencing homelessness). Both in terms of fully documenting and analyzing housing needs and in terms of developing policies, programs and affordable housing sites strategies, the draft Housing Element’s treatment of special housing needs tended to be more high-level and/or cursory than required or expected by HCD.

Recommendations

- 1) In addition to the general data in the housing needs section, prepare detailed assessments of special housing needs and clearly connect special housing needs findings to programs, policies and sites strategies that are concrete and actionable.

7. Unique and Recent Comments: Accessory Dwelling Units, SB 9 and AB 215

Observation

Numerous jurisdiction-specific comments were noted in the review letters, but three major types of comments are especially worthy of elevation to inform Bay Area Housing Elements. These concern how jurisdictions count units towards their RHNA using past Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) development trends as well as more recent guidance regarding SB 9 and AB 215.

Recommendations

- 1) **ADUs:** Average at least the past three years of production rather than one recent year to determine the anticipated development of ADUs during the eight-year planning period.
- 2) **SB 9:** The lack of clear, published guidance may have led some jurisdictions to over-estimate unit production related to the state's adoption of SB 9. As with the sites inventory generally, potential SB 9 sites require detailed site by site analysis. Carefully review the guidance recently provided by HCD on this topic, which can be found [here](#).
- 3) **AB 215 and Public Outreach:** AB 215 adds an additional 30-day review period plus 10 business days for jurisdictions to consider comments before drafts can be submitted to HCD. Jurisdictions should plan to make drafts available for comment per AB 215 and HCD guidance to ensure that the public has adequate opportunity to comment on drafts before elements are submitted for HCD review.



Regional Housing Technical Assistance Year One Highlights

Building on the foundation laid last year to launch ABAG's Regional Housing Technical Assistance (RHTA) Program, this year was spent developing the staffing and program infrastructure and creating the technical assistance to help Bay Area jurisdictions implement the sixth cycle of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Since the project launched, the RHTA team has run 19 live, interactive webinars for about 2,000 attendees from Bay Area jurisdictions. The team has also launched seven county-based planning collaboratives to provide staff with resources and forums for discussion and provided services as varied as housing simulation tools, communications resources and numerous technical assistance products. Highlights include:

- Launched the new Housing TA Portal, providing a one-stop-shop for access to technical assistance case studies, data sets, interactive tools, model ordinances, reports, toolkits, trainings and much more.
- Refined existing technical assistance products and data tools, including developing "2.0" modules for the HESS tool and new "affirmatively furthering fair housing" and SB 9 material.
- Launched Work Groups focusing on Missing Middle Housing and Wildfire Resilience. The groups produced a series of products available to jurisdiction staff across the region, including an interactive tool that highlights the middle housing development potential throughout the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Partnered with Balancing Act to develop an online public engagement housing simulation tool that helps residents visualize sites for housing development in their communities. Through this partnership, ABAG has been able to provide free access to 25 jurisdictions and negotiate reduced-cost subscriptions for other Bay Area jurisdictions.
- Established a Regional Planning Bench and an online tool for procurement through City Innovate. The Bench and tool work together to streamline the contracting process for jurisdictions seeking to hire consultants for various parts of their Housing Element process.
- Procured 10 free licenses for Bay Area communities to pilot an innovative online tool that streamlines residential site plan review for applicants and planners. Licenses to the Plancheck Program software were provided in partnership with Symbium.
- Created a communications tool kit, including content and images for a social media campaign, a survey for jurisdictions to assess resident sentiment around housing, and information for elected officials to use in discussing housing with community members.
- Developed best practices for engagement with multilingual audiences, launched a process for helping jurisdictions access translation and interpretation services, and provided jurisdictions with remote meeting tools.

Index of Regional Housing Technical Assistance Products

Webinars

All materials are available on this webpage: <https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/regional-housing-technical-assistance/training>

- Housing Planning: For the Future
- Planning Innovations Webinar: Regional Data Tools for the Housing Element
- Housing Element 101 - Overview and New Laws + Tips
- Creating Capacity: An Overview of the Sites Inventory
- Using Data Effectively in Housing Element Updates – ABAG’s Housing Needs Data Packets and Accessing the US Census
- How to Talk About Housing – Data-Driven Lessons on Housing Communications that Work and Those that Backfire
- Incorporating Environmental Justice and Safety into your Housing Element
- Housing Sites Inventory - Deep Dive
- Engage How To! Introduction to Remote Meeting Tools
- Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: The Nuts and Bolts with HCD
- Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: Data Deep Dive
- Integrating Climate Adaptation/Resilience into Your Housing Element
- Context of SB 9 and Potential Impacts
- HESS Tool 1.0 Tutorial Webinar
- Surplus Public Land: webinar and presentation
- New Housing Law: webinar and presentation
- Keep Calm and Certify On: Tips from Early Adopters
- New Annual Progress Report Requirements with HCD
- Webinar for Elected Officials: Learn About Available Assistance for Housing Element Updates

Housing Data Tools

[Housing Needs Data Packets](#) for all 109 Bay Area jurisdictions contain tables, figures, and accompanying text for over 60 data points that can be placed directly into the Housing Needs section of each jurisdiction’s housing element. The data packets were [pre-reviewed by HCD for consistency with state requirements](#) to create predictability during the Housing Element review process.

[Housing Element Site Selection “HESS” Tool](#), launched in Fall 2020, is a web-based mapping platform that assists Bay Area jurisdictions with site identification for Housing Element site inventories and flags sites that will likely require rezoning to be used under new state laws. In Fall 2021, ABAG launched a [1.0 update](#) to the HESS Tool based on feedback received from local planning staff, consultants, subject-matter experts and HCD. Updates included more granular screening categories, additional filters, an editing module to update underlying local land use data, and more

Upcoming

ABAG has begun the development of two new **HESS Tool 2.0 Modules**, slated for release in 2022. The first module is an **AFFH Map** and is currently available; it allows local planners to visualize the distribution of their site inventories alongside key AFFH data layers. The second module will support jurisdictions with the **Realistic**

Capacity Calculations for sites included in their inventories and will be available in early 2022. ABAG has collected and analyzed data from local jurisdictions' Annual Progress Reports, Zoning Ordinances, and General Plans to adjust the theoretical maximum capacity of sites to reflect historical building trends more accurately. Users will be able to generate realistic capacity reports prepopulated with this data, which can be submitted to HCD as supportive documentation.

Webinar Recordings

- 10/29/2020: [Planning Innovations Webinar: Regional Data Tools for the Housing Element: Webinar video recording](#) and [Webinar presentation](#)
- 3/9/2021: ABAG Housing Element Series: [Creating Capacity: An Overview of the Sites Inventory: Webinar video recording](#) and [Webinar presentation](#)
- 3/23/2021: ABAG Housing Element Series: [Using Data Effectively in Housing Element Updates: Webinar video recording](#) and [Webinar presentation](#). Introduces the ABAG housing needs data packets and provides information on accessing the U.S. Census.
- [HESS Tool 1.0 Tutorial Webinar](#)

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Staff hosted two webinars and launched the first set of AFFH resource products during the summer of 2021. The first webinar, *AFFH: The Nuts and Bolts with HCD*, was held June 22 and covered the basics of AB 686 and outlined new requirements for the Housing Element. The second webinar, *AFFH: Data Deep Dive*, was held July 13 and served as a more focused look into the analysis required for the Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH), and specifically the segregation and integration patterns analysis, which featured ABAG's work with UC Merced via the [STIR Labs partnership](#). Both webinar recordings and presentation materials can be found on ABAG's Regional Housing Technical Assistance Training [website](#).

As a follow up to the July webinar, the AFFH template [staff report](#) and [slide deck](#) were released for jurisdiction staff to use in introducing the new requirements to their local decisionmakers. Additionally, staff disseminated a [Draft Data Guidance Checklist](#) which provides sources to data points outlined in the AFH. The final version of this checklist is in development and pending release this fall.

Additional AFFH TA includes:

- Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Policy Resources - [Annotated Bibliography](#)
- AFFH layer added to HESS tool
- [Segregation and Land Use Reports](#)
- [AFFH Tips Memo](#)
- Leading with Equity Working Group in progress

Upcoming

- More Policies and Programs Guidance
- AFFH messaging guide

Communications, Messaging & Community Engagement

- Housing Element Webinar: [How to Talk About Housing](#) – Data-Driven Lessons on Housing Communications that Work and Those that Backfire (4/27/2021)
- Housing Element Webinar: [Engage How To! Introduction to Remote Meeting Tools](#) (5/25/2021)

- Balancing Act online public engagement housing simulation tool available for 25 jurisdictions and reduced rate negotiated for additional jurisdictions
- [Access to template survey](#) for jurisdictions to send to community members to gather information about housing issues and concerns
- Access to tool kit, including messaging guide to provide assistance in discussing housing and AFFH with community members. Several items of the tool kit have already been produced and are available on the website.
- [New Housing TA portal](#), allowing ease of access to range of relevant materials
- [Guide to Housing Element + AFFH Public Participation](#)
- Assistance with translation and interpretation ([link](#)).

Upcoming

- AFFH communications and Housing Messaging Guide
- Executive Summary and Guide for Outreach to Equity Priority Communities
- Additional outreach support available for jurisdictions
- AFFH outreach after comment letters

Peer Cohorts and Work Groups

- Missing Middle Workgroup
 - a. Products
 1. Slide templates and talking points for use by staff
 2. Market report and interactive feasibility analysis tool
 3. Zoning guidebook
 4. Affordability strategies guidebook
 5. RHNA guidance memo
 6. [Middle Market Housing Development Tool](#)
 - b. Links
 - [Session 1: What is the Missing Middle?](#)
 - [Session 2: The Middle Housing Market](#)
 - [Session 3: Making Middle Housing Happen](#)
 - [Session 4: Making Middle Housing Affordable](#)
 - [Session 5: Projecting Middle Housing Production](#)
- Wildfire: all four sessions including webinar recordings, presentations, and resource guides are on [this website](#).
- “Big 3” Cohort (Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose)
- Leading with Equity Work Group

Upcoming

- Malls & Office Parks
- Agricultural Communities Cohort

Other Regional Products

- SB 9 materials from November webinars, FAQ, staff report and presentation template, summary <https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/regional-housing-technical-assistance/sb-9-resources>
- Upcoming SB 9 TA
 - Model Ordinance
 - SB 9 Application Checklist
 - Affidavit regarding owner-occupancy
 - Optional affidavit regarding tenant occupancy
 - Sample deed restriction for two-unit developments
 - Same deed restriction for urban lot splits
- ADU Affordability Safe Harbor – counting towards RHNA
- [Consequences of Non-Compliance with Housing Element Update](#)
- Pilot of Symbium Plancheck software to streamline permitting ([see announcement](#))
- Parking TA:
 - [Parking toolbox and handbook](#)
 - [Parking presentation and webinars](#)
 - Future parking assistance [sign up form](#)

Upcoming

- Farm Labor Housing Guidebook

Templates

- [Jurisdiction Housing Element RFP Template](#) a request for Proposals (RFP) template for local jurisdictions to hire consultants to assist with Housing Element updates
- [Housing Element Staff Report Template](#)
- [Housing Element Timeline Template](#)
- [What is a Housing Element? Briefer Template](#)
 - [What is a Housing Element? Briefer Template \(Word version\)](#)
 - [What is a Housing Element? Briefer Template \(Spanish translation version\)](#)
 - [What is a Housing Element? Briefer Template \(Chinese translation version\)](#)
- [Housing Element FAQs Template](#)
- [AFFH Template Staff Report](#)
- [AFFH Template Staff Slide Deck](#)
- [Draft AFFH Data Guidance Checklist](#)

Upcoming

- Final AFFH Data Guidance Checklist
- Template Segregation and Land Use Reports

Resilience TA

- [Briefer on Integrated Planning - EJ and Safety Element Updates](#)
- [Sample Agenda for Integrating Planning](#)
- [Safety Element New Requirements](#)
- [Status of Resilience and EJ Planning in the Bay Area](#)

- ABAG webinar co-hosted by California Office of Planning & Research: [Incorporating Environmental Justice and Safety into your Housing Element: Webinar video recording](#) and [Webinar presentation](#)

Regional Planning Consulting Bench

ABAG has established a Regional Planning Bench with 92 consultants in 11 service categories. The Bench is available to all jurisdictions in the Bay Area to use in accordance with their local procurement rules.

ABAG launched a labor-saving online tool from City Innovate that allows jurisdictions to easily search bench consultant profiles and compare consultants' qualifications and rates. The tool also facilitates informal solicitations of quotes for work when applicable procurement rules allow.

Related Links

- [Frequently Asked Questions](#) regarding the Grants and Regional Planning Consulting Bench
- [Request for Qualifications](#) used to select the Regional Planning Consulting Bench

Local Grants

Funding amounts can be found in this [Grant Amounts spreadsheet](#). Draft funding agreements were sent to all Bay Area jurisdictions in July offering each the option of receiving reimbursements for eligible expenses, or the option of electing to have ABAG hold the funds and administer consulting contracts on behalf of the recipient jurisdiction. [REAP Non-competitive Allocation: Eligible Activities](#)

County Planning Collaboratives

County-based groups staffed by a paid coordinator who provides technical assistance and facilitates cross-jurisdiction engagement for the Housing Element updates and other housing-related topics.

Collaborative Contacts:

1. Alameda: Meredith Rupp, UPP, MRupp@up-partners.com
2. Contra Costa: Joan Chaplick, MIG, joanc@migcom.com
3. Marin: Jillian Zeiger, Marin County, jzeiger@marincounty.org
4. Napa/Sonoma: Jane Riley, 4Leaf, jriley@4leafinc.com
5. Santa Clara: Paul Peninger, BAIRD + DRISKELL, peninger@bdplanning.com
6. San Mateo: Josh Abrams, BAIRD + DRISKELL, abrams@bdplanning.com
7. Solano: Robert Guerrero, STA, rguerrero@sta.ca.gov

Recording of Planning Collaboratives Kick-Off April 13, 2021. This webinar introduces the County Planning Collaboratives.

- [Planning Collaboratives Kick-Off: Webinar video recording](#)
- [Planning Collaboratives Kick-Off: Presentation](#)
- Additional resource from the webinar: [A Collaborative Approach to Addressing our Housing Challenges](#)

HCD TA

- [Housing Planning Hub Site](#) is a repository of statewide and regional toolkits, factsheets, and guidance on a variety of housing policy areas with a specific focus on [priority policy areas](#). HCD will continually update the resource center as new tools become available.
- [Prohousing Designation](#) free technical assistance to gain designation and bonus points for state funding programs.

- [Housing Element Educational Video](#) for the 6th cycle housing element update targeting local elected officials, stakeholders, and the public. This video is available for free in English and Spanish with closed captioning. Local governments can embed links to the video on their websites.



**ASSOCIATION
OF BAY AREA
GOVERNMENTS**



Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Housing Finance Authority
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

DATE: May 12, 2022
TO: ABAG Housing Committee and BAHFA Oversight Committee
FR: Executive Director
RE: Status of Local Suballocations of REAP Funding

The ABAG Executive Board has approved the suballocation of a total of \$10.88M of the \$24M Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant funds to local jurisdictions in the Bay Area. Each of the 109 members of ABAG has been suballocated a minimum of \$20,000 to support local housing planning with supplemental suballocations based on the number of RHNA units received. REAP suballocations also include support for seven Subregional Planning Collaboratives where paid technical assistance providers focus on priorities set by local planners who choose to participate. The amounts of each suballocation can be found at this [link](#).

REAP funding can be used to reimburse local planning expenses that accelerate housing, including expenses associated with Housing Element updates. Eligible housing planning expenses incurred as far back as October 1, 2019, can be reimbursed by REAP suballocations. ABAG solicited letters of interest ("LOIs") from all 109 jurisdictions early 2021 and 100% participated by submitting LOIs setting forth their local housing planning priorities to be funded by the REAP suballocations. ABAG has also received work plans from the locally selected Steering Committees for all Subregional Planning Collaboratives.

Draft Suballocation Funding Agreements were sent by email to local staff who submitted the 109 LOIs in July of 2021. As of April 18, 2022, MTC/ABAG staff was working with 68 jurisdictions and all seven Subregional Planning Collaboratives on their REAP suballocations totaling \$9,349,001. However, the 41 jurisdictions listed in the attachment to this memorandum have yet to respond to their award notifications totaling \$1,530,999. Staff is reaching out to these jurisdictions to offer one-on-one assistance to complete their Agreements. Time is of the essence as REAP funding must be fully expended by December 31, 2023.

Therese W. McMillan

Unclaimed REAP Suballocations

(\$1,863,304.00 as of 4/14/22)

| Jurisdiction | County | Amount | | Jurisdiction | County | Amount |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Alameda | Alameda | \$ 58,058.00 | | Napa County | Napa | \$ 102,201.00 |
| American Canyon | Napa | \$ 20,000.00 | | Newark | Alameda | \$ 33,321.00 |
| Atherton | San Mateo | \$ 20,000.00 | | Oakley | Contra Costa | \$ 27,521.00 |
| Belmont | San Mateo | \$ 32,688.00 | | Pacifica | San Mateo | \$ 33,449.00 |
| Brentwood | Contra Costa | \$ 30,819.00 | | Petaluma | Sonoma | \$ 33,577.00 |
| Burlingame | San Mateo | \$ 43,152.00 | | Pinole | Contra Costa | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Colma | San Mateo | \$ 20,000.00 | | Pleasant Hill | Contra Costa | \$ 32,809.00 |
| Cotati | Sonoma | \$ 70,000.00 | | Portola Valley | San Mateo | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Cupertino | Santa Clara | \$ 52,613.00 | | Rio Vista | Solano | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Daly City | San Mateo | \$ 54,390.00 | | San Anselmo | Marin | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Danville | Contra Costa | \$ 35,930.00 | | Santa Clara City | Santa Clara | \$ 102,684.00 |
| Dixon | Solano | \$ 20,000.00 | | Santa Rosa | Sonoma | \$ 53,310.00 |
| Emeryville | Alameda | \$ 32,902.00 | | Sausalito | Marin | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Fairfield | Solano | \$ 41,659.00 | | South San Francisco | San Mateo | \$ 48,128.00 |
| Healdsburg | Sonoma | \$ 20,000.00 | | St. Helena | Napa | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Hercules | Contra Costa | \$ 20,000.00 | | Suisun City | Solano | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Marin County | Marin | \$ 45,377.00 | | Vacaville | Solano | \$ 33,236.00 |
| Martinez | Contra Costa | \$ 29,561.00 | | Vallejo | Solano | \$ 40,884.00 |
| Millbrae | San Mateo | \$ 35,631.00 | | Woodside | San Mateo | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Moraga | Contra Costa | \$ 27,947.00 | | Yountville | Napa | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Mountain View | Santa Clara | \$ 99,152.00 | | | | |



Association of Bay Area Governments



Technical Assistance
for Local Planning

HOUSING

Regional Housing Technical Assistance (RHTA) Update

ABAG Housing & BAHFA
Oversight Committees

May 12, 2022

Update topics

1. HCD's Actions on 6th Cycle Housing Elements to date
2. Recently released Technical Assistance, including SB9
3. Housing Element Deadlines & Consequences
4. Status of local suballocations of REAP Funding

6th Cycle Housing Element Statistics (as of 4/14/22)


STATEWIDE: 27% CERTIFIED

| COG | TOTAL SUBMITTED | HCD CERTIFIED |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| SLOCOG Due 12/31/20 | 8 | 100% |
| SANDAG Due 4/15/21 | 19 | 37% |
| SACOG Due 5/15/21 | 28 | 61% |
| SCAG Due 10/15/21 | 197 | 4% |

AFFH GUIDANCE ISSUED 4/27/21

ROOM FOR GROWTH:

A summary of HCD comments



AFFH

94%

Sites Inventory

of those with sites
inventory comments

94%

● Realistic Capacity 73%

● Non Vacant Sites 65%

Public Participation

67%

ABAG has extensive TA to address each of these

TA to Address HCD's Common Comments

AFFH

- [109 Segregation reports](#)
- [AFFH Policy Tips Memo](#)
- [AFFH Policies Toolkit](#)
- [AFFH Data Guidance Checklist](#)
- High-Resource Areas [Question and Answer Session](#) with HCD

Public Participation

- Housing Communications Guide for Local Governments:
- Primer for Engaging Equity Priority Communities
- Multi-lingual Community Survey Template & Social Media Toolkit
- Translation Services

Sites Inventories: HESS 2.0

- Realistic Capacity Module
- AFFH Map Layers

Technical Assistance on SB9

- Legal summary
- FAQs
- Implementation webinar by Goldfarb & Lipman
- Templates for staff report & slide deck
- Drawings of home types enabled by SB 9
- Permit Application checklist
- Model ordinance
- Planner's worksheet
- Sample deed restrictions
- Sample declarations of owner occupancy & prior tenancy
- ***SB 9 Guidance for RHNA***

New Housing Element Timing

Drafts should be posted in April/May to allow adequate time for:

- Newly mandated public comment period
- Extended 90-day HCD initial review period
- Revision, public hearings, adoption & submission to HCD by 1/31/23
- Certification by HCD by 5/31/23

Consequences of Missing Deadlines



If a jurisdiction needs to rezone for lower income units but has not done so by January 31, 2023:

- Rezoning must be “by right.”

If a housing element is not adopted by January 31, 2023:*

- Not eligible for certain housing funds.

120 days after Housing Element adoption deadline



If the housing element is not certified by May 31, 2023:

- Rezoning must be completed within 1 year instead of 3+.

Whether 1 year or 3+ years



If rezoning is not complete by the due date:

- HCD could decertify the housing element, with risk of legal action.
- Housing projects consistent with housing element must be approved even if zoning is not complete.

Grant Agreement Update

(as of 4/18/22)

- **GRANT AGREEMENTS TOTALING \$9,349,001 IN PROCESS**
(suballocations to 68 of 109 local jurisdictions, plus 7 Planning Collaboratives)
 - 31 approved
 - 14 drafts in review
 - 23 in conversation
- **UNCLAIMED: 41 of 109 local suballocations totaling \$1,530,999**



Thank You.

Heather Peters

hpeters@BayAreaMetro.gov



Metropolitan Transportation Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 22-0740 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Report **Status:** Informational
File created: 4/7/2022 **In control:** ABAG Housing Committee
On agenda: 5/12/2022 **Final action:**
Title: Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Progress Report (2018-20)

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.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [10a 0 HIP Status Update.pdf](#)
[10a 1 HIP Attachment 1.pdf](#)
[10a 2 HIP Attachment 2.pdf](#)

| Date | Ver. | Action By | Action | Result |
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|
|------|------|-----------|--------|--------|

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

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.

Mallory Atkinson

ABAG Housing Committee Information
BAHFA Oversight Committee Information

May 12, 2022

Agenda Item 10.a.

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.

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 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, qualifying preserved units were reflected 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. Jurisdictions are encouraged 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.

Recommended Action:

Information

Attachments:

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

Reviewed:



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% |

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 |
| 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 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 | 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% |

| 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% |

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 |
| 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 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 |
| 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% |

| 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% |

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 |
| 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 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 |
| 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% |

| 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% |

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 |
| 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 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 |
| 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% |

| 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% |

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 |
| 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 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 |
| 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% |

| 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.