

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Programming and Allocations Committee**

June 14, 2023

Agenda Item 2j - 23-0774

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Progress Report (2018-21)

Subject:

Update on the first four years of progress on the Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program (2018 to 2021).

Background:

This agenda item provides an update on the first four years of progress (2018 to 2021) on the Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) program, which rewards Bay Area jurisdictions that produced or preserved the most affordable housing over a five-year period. Housing progress for the remaining year (2022) will be reflected in future HIP program reporting as data becomes available.

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 federal 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 to the 15 jurisdictions that produced or preserved 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 2021 production and preservation data into ongoing HIP program standings by jurisdiction. In 2021 alone, Bay Area PDAs and TPAs saw over 3,300 new affordable units added and an additional 72 units preserved. Since the beginning of the five-year

program, from 2018 to 2021, jurisdictions have built or preserved more than 9,000 affordable units in PDAs or TPAs. Nearly half (44%) of the qualifying units in that period were located in San Francisco. When including the next three cities – Oakland, Fremont, and San Jose – the top 4 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 2021 that qualify for HIP comprise only a fraction (11%) of the total housing built in that time. **Attachment 2** lists the total number of housing units built in each jurisdiction from 2018 to 2021 – including all levels of affordability, deed restriction status, and relationship to PDAs and/or TPAs.

Issues:

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 the final 2022 report. HIP unit data will be considered draft until the program awards are finalized after 2022 data is available, anticipated in early 2024. Staff expect to return to this Committee and the Programming and Allocations Committee in Spring 2024 to report on final results and provide further instructions to successful jurisdictions on programming the HIP incentive funding.

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. Recently, the PCEP project reported achievement of a full funding plan from state and federal sources, and therefore staff does not anticipate being asked to contribute additional funding to complete the project.

Recommendations:

Information.

Attachments:

1. HIP Program Status Report (2018-21)
2. All New Housing Units (2018-21)

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Andrew B. Fremier". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "A".

Andrew B. Fremier

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Status Report: 2018 to 2021

Current Rank	Jurisdiction	2018 New	2018 Prsvd	2018 Total	2019 New	2019 Prsvd	2019 Total	2020 New	2020 Prsvd	2020 Total	2021 New	2021 Prsvd	2021 Total	Total New	Total Prsvd	Total Units
1	San Francisco	652	50	702	1,097	95	1,192	538	187	725	1,367	28	1,395	3,654	360	4,014
2	Oakland	39	56	95	4	-	4	183	199	382	489	44	533	715	299	1,014
3	Fremont	1	-	1	100	-	100	121	-	121	408	-	408	630	-	630
4	San Jose	30	-	30	215	-	215	99	-	99	63	-	63	407	-	407
5	Richmond	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	268	-	268	268	-	268
6	American Canyon	-	-	-	69	-	69	-	-	-	159	-	159	228	-	228
7	Sunnyvale	57	-	57	91	23	114	1	-	1	55	-	55	204	23	227
8	Daly City	3	-	3	-	-	-	210	-	210	4	-	4	217	-	217
9	Mountain View	16	-	16	67	-	67	114	-	114	16	-	16	213	-	213
10	Redwood City	-	-	-	7	47	54	-	-	-	152	-	152	159	47	206
11	Santa Rosa	79	-	79	-	-	-	-	-	-	89	-	89	168	-	168
12	San Mateo	16	-	16	7	-	7	116	-	116	14	-	14	153	-	153
13	Pleasanton	33	-	33	53	-	53	30	-	30	-	-	-	116	-	116
14	Livermore	-	-	-	74	-	74	34	-	34	-	-	-	108	-	108
15	Emeryville	1	-	1	77	-	77	15	-	15	11	-	11	104	-	104
16	Walnut Creek	58	-	58	-	-	-	45	-	45	-	-	-	103	-	103
17	South San Francisco	1	-	1	81	-	81	-	-	-	19	-	19	101	-	101
18	Morgan Hill	29	-	29	23	-	23	41	-	41	-	-	-	93	-	93
19	Concord	-	-	-	-	79	79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79	79
20	El Cerrito	15	-	15	62	-	62	-	-	-	-	-	-	77	-	77
21	Santa Clara	7	-	7	-	-	-	8	-	8	51	-	51	66	-	66
22	Fairfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	64	1	-	1	1	64	65
23	Alameda	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	-	59	2	-	2	61	-	61
24	Windsor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60	-	60	60	-	60
25	Sonoma County	59	-	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	-	59
26	Contra Costa County	-	-	-	42	-	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	42	-	42
27	Berkeley	13	-	13	-	-	-	22	-	22	5	-	5	40	-	40
28	Sebastopol	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	-	31	31	-	31
29	Hayward	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	26	-	26	30	-	30
30	Campbell	18	-	18	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	23
31	Hercules	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15	15	-	15
32	San Rafael	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	8	-	8	10	-	10
32	Danville	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	10	10	-	10
34	Novato	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	-	9	-	9
35	San Mateo County	8	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	8
36	Lafayette	7	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7
37	Menlo Park	-	-	-	3	-	3	2	-	2	-	-	-	5	-	5
38	Palo Alto	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	2
39	Pittsburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
39	Los Gatos	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
39	San Pablo	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
All	Total	1,144	106	1,250	2,077	244	2,321	1,654	450	2,104	3,325	72	3,397	8,200	872	9,072

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 data is available. Only jurisdictions with at least one qualifying HIP unit between 2018 and 2021 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	-	91	-	195	286
Alameda	32	29	-	86	147
Albany	-	-	21	-	21
Berkeley	40	-	-	936	976
Dublin	-	-	40	2,179	2,219
Emeryville	47	39	18	313	417
Fremont	339	345	25	2,798	3,507
Hayward	-	20	67	1,022	1,109
Livermore	106	15	101	665	887
Newark	-	-	-	946	946
Oakland	590	113	13	8,039	8,755
Piedmont	7	13	12	24	56
Pleasanton	84	47	40	539	710
San Leandro	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	12	270	282
Alameda County Total	1,245	712	349	18,012	20,318
Share of County Total	6%	4%	2%	89%	100%
Share of Regional Total	24%	15%	9%	29%	27%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Alameda County	-	27	-	13	5
Alameda	32	29	-	74	135
Albany	-	-	13	-	13
Berkeley	40	-	-	833	873
Dublin	-	-	-	1,020	1,020
Emeryville	47	39	18	313	417
Fremont	304	301	25	2,237	2,867
Hayward	-	20	22	475	517
Livermore	106	-	30	458	594
Newark	-	-	-	661	661
Oakland	590	113	13	7,696	8,412
Piedmont	-	-	-	-	-
Pleasanton	77	39	6	298	420
San Leandro	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	2	245	247
Alameda County	1,196	568	129	14,323	16,216
Share of County Total	7%	4%	1%	88%	100%
Share of Regional Total	28%	18%	6%	34%	31%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Alameda County	-	-	-	-
Alameda	32	29	-	61
Albany	-	-	-	-
Berkeley	40	-	-	40
Dublin	-	-	-	-
Emeryville	47	39	18	104
Fremont	304	301	25	630
Hayward	-	20	10	30
Livermore	106	-	2	108
Newark	-	-	-	-
Oakland	590	113	12	715
Piedmont	-	-	-	-
Pleasanton	77	39	-	116
San Leandro	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	-	-
Alameda County	1,196	541	67	1,804
Share of County Total	66%	30%	4%	100%
Share of Regional Total	28%	18%	7%	22%

Contra Costa County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Antioch	99	7	52	752	910
Brentwood	2	2	34	409	447
Clayton	-	4	-	-	4
Concord	-	-	5	168	173
Contra Costa County	71	181	3	809	1,064
Danville	10	25	18	240	293
El Cerrito	62	5	10	201	278
Hercules	-	15	-	479	494
Lafayette	-	1	30	129	160
Martinez	-	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	6	82	88
Oakley	-	80	-	1,019	1,099
Orinda	-	-	27	184	211
Pinole	-	-	-	8	8
Pittsburg	26	207	69	303	605
Pleasant Hill	-	-	19	69	88
Richmond	27	241	-	428	696
San Pablo	-	7	8	8	23
San Ramon	31	93	162	858	1,144
Walnut Creek	94	18	25	529	666
Contra Costa County Total	422	886	468	6,675	8,451
Share of County Total	5%	10%	6%	79%	100%
Share of Regional Total	8%	19%	12%	11%	11%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Antioch	2	1	18	118	139
Brentwood	-	-	-	21	21
Clayton	-	-	-	-	-
Concord	-	-	-	15	15
Contra Costa County	42	1	-	243	286
Danville	10	-	-	134	144
El Cerrito	62	5	10	186	263
Hercules	-	15	-	477	492
Lafayette	-	-	10	75	85
Martinez	-	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	-	42	42
Oakley	-	1	-	37	38
Orinda	-	-	-	-	-
Pinole	-	-	-	7	7
Pittsburg	-	1	2	30	33
Pleasant Hill	-	-	5	43	48
Richmond	27	241	-	337	605
San Pablo	-	7	7	6	20
San Ramon	-	-	-	1	1
Walnut Creek	94	11	2	418	525
Contra Costa County	237	283	54	2,190	2,764
Share of County Total	9%	10%	2%	79%	100%
Share of Regional Total	6%	9%	3%	5%	5%

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	10	-	-	10
El Cerrito	62	5	10	77
Hercules	-	15	-	15
Lafayette	-	-	7	7
Martinez	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	-	-
Oakley	-	-	-	-
Orinda	-	-	-	-
Pinole	-	-	-	-
Pittsburg	-	1	-	1
Pleasant Hill	-	-	-	-
Richmond	27	241	-	268
San Pablo	-	1	-	1
San Ramon	-	-	-	-
Walnut Creek	94	8	1	103
Contra Costa County	235	271	18	524
Share of County Total	45%	52%	3%	100%
Share of Regional Total	6%	9%	2%	6%

Marin County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Belvedere	-	-	2	-	2
Corte Madera	9	3	6	16	34
Fairfax	18	47	15	1	81
Larkspur	2	-	-	4	6
Marin County	9	7	3	123	142
Mill Valley	3	3	5	4	15
Novato	27	10	-	163	200
Ross	4	2	2	2	10
San Anselmo	6	6	12	10	34
San Rafael	6	44	3	134	187
Sausalito	-	3	5	2	10
Tiburon	-	-	1	7	8
Marin County Total	84	125	54	466	729
Share of County Total	12%	17%	7%	64%	100%
Share of Regional Total	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Belvedere	-	-	-	-	-
Corte Madera	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfax	-	-	-	-	-
Larkspur	-	-	-	3	3
Marin County	-	-	-	3	3
Mill Valley	-	-	-	-	-
Novato	9	4	-	72	85
Ross	-	-	-	-	-
San Anselmo	-	-	-	-	-
San Rafael	6	9	-	67	82
Sausalito	-	2	3	-	5
Tiburon	-	-	-	-	-
Marin County	15	15	3	145	178
Share of County Total	8%	8%	2%	81%	100%
Share of Regional Total	0%	0%	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	6	4	-	10
Sausalito	-	-	-	-
Tiburon	-	-	-	-
Marin County	11	8	-	19
Share of County Total	0%	0%	0%	0%
Share of Regional Total	0%	0%	0%	0%

Napa County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
American Canyon	59	31	144	2	236
Calistoga	23	9	4	28	64
Napa	-	12	12	111	135
Napa County	4	3	8	17	32
Saint Helena	-	-	-	25	25
Yountville	-	-	5	4	9
Napa County Total	86	55	173	187	501
Share of County Total	17%	11%	35%	37%	100%
Share of Regional Total	2%	1%	4%	0%	1%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
American Canyon	57	28	143	1	229
Calistoga	-	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	-	-	2	2
Napa County	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Helena	-	-	-	-	-
Yountville	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	57	28	143	3	231
Share of County Total	25%	12%	62%	1%	100%
Share of Regional Total	1%	1%	7%	0%	0%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
American Canyon	57	28	143	228
Calistoga	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	-	-	-
Napa County	-	-	-	-
Saint Helena	-	-	-	-
Yountville	-	-	-	-
Napa County	57	28	143	228
Share of County Total	25%	12%	63%	100%
Share of Regional Total	1%	1%	16%	3%

San Francisco County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
San Francisco	1,615	1,570	1,320	12,967	17,472
San Francisco County Total	1,615	1,570	1,320	12,967	17,472
Share of County Total	9%	9%	8%	74%	100%
Share of Regional Total	31%	33%	33%	21%	23%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
San Francisco	1,615	1,570	1,310	12,962	17,457
San Francisco County	1,615	1,570	1,310	12,962	17,457
Share of County Total	9%	9%	8%	74%	100%
Share of Regional Total	38%	49%	62%	30%	34%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
San Francisco	1,615	1,570	469	3,654
San Francisco County	1,615	1,570	469	3,654
Share of County Total	44%	43%	13%	100%
Share of Regional Total	38%	51%	52%	45%

San Mateo County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Atherton	10	3	3	65	81
Belmont	-	-	25	44	69
Brisbane	-	2	10	14	26
Burlingame	-	-	-	59	59
Colma	-	-	-	8	8
Daly City	20	255	136	295	706
East Palo Alto	6	6	3	4	19
Foster City	14	32	9	386	441
Half Moon Bay	-	-	27	53	80
Hillsborough	6	7	3	5	21
Menlo Park	29	26	2	331	388
Millbrae	4	6	3	18	31
Pacifica	-	-	-	34	34
Portola Valley	16	2	5	13	36
Redwood City	124	88	-	1,002	1,214
San Bruno	4	17	2	121	144
San Carlos	-	-	-	30	30
San Mateo	124	46	29	1,009	1,208
San Mateo County	7	45	54	192	298
South San Francisco	89	8	74	416	587
Woodside	15	4	2	33	54
San Mateo County Total	468	547	387	4,132	5,534
Share of County Total	8%	10%	7%	75%	100%
Share of Regional Total	9%	12%	10%	7%	7%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Atherton	5	1	-	17	23
Belmont	-	-	8	2	10
Brisbane	-	-	-	-	-
Burlingame	-	-	-	48	48
Colma	-	-	-	8	8
Daly City	20	212	65	218	515
East Palo Alto	3	3	1	-	7
Foster City	-	-	-	-	-
Half Moon Bay	-	-	-	-	-
Hillsborough	-	-	-	-	-
Menlo Park	8	7	2	52	69
Millbrae	2	-	1	15	18
Pacifica	-	-	-	8	8
Portola Valley	-	-	-	-	-
Redwood City	124	55	-	1,002	1,181
San Bruno	2	5	1	83	91
San Carlos	-	-	-	16	16
San Mateo	124	36	15	914	1,089
San Mateo County	7	13	23	26	69
South San Francisco	82	3	42	407	534
Woodside	-	-	-	-	-
San Mateo County	377	335	158	2,816	3,686
Share of County Total	10%	9%	4%	76%	100%
Share of Regional Total	9%	11%	7%	7%	7%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Atherton	-	-	-	-
Belmont	-	-	-	-
Brisbane	-	-	-	-
Burlingame	-	-	-	-
Colma	-	-	-	-
Daly City	20	186	11	217
East Palo Alto	-	-	-	-
Foster City	-	-	-	-
Half Moon Bay	-	-	-	-
Hillsborough	-	-	-	-
Menlo Park	-	3	2	5
Millbrae	-	-	-	-
Pacifica	-	-	-	-
Portola Valley	-	-	-	-
Redwood City	124	35	-	159
San Bruno	-	-	-	-
San Carlos	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	124	28	1	153
San Mateo County	-	8	-	8
South San Francisco	81	-	20	101
Woodside	-	-	-	-
San Mateo County	349	260	34	643
Share of County Total	54%	40%	5%	100%
Share of Regional Total	8%	9%	4%	8%

Santa Clara County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Campbell	11	2	10	280	303
Cupertino	-	-	15	9	24
Gilroy	-	-	-	210	210
Los Altos	-	-	-	25	25
Los Altos Hills	17	9	4	60	90
Los Gatos	-	-	66	48	114
Milpitas	14	5	5	1,252	1,276
Monte Sereno	24	2	7	25	58
Morgan Hill	72	55	359	684	1,170
Mountain View	77	250	-	2,180	2,507
Palo Alto	-	2	-	92	94
San Jose	567	-	-	3,322	3,889
Santa Clara	-	6	61	2,934	3,001
Saratoga	-	2	3	-	5
Sunnyvale	76	99	251	1,973	2,399
Santa Clara County Total	858	432	781	13,094	15,165
Share of County Total	6%	3%	5%	86%	100%
Share of Regional Total	17%	9%	20%	21%	20%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Campbell	11	2	10	248	271
Cupertino	-	-	2	-	2
Gilroy	-	-	-	1	1
Los Altos	-	-	-	1	1
Los Altos Hills	-	-	-	-	-
Los Gatos	-	-	5	6	11
Milpitas	1	-	-	990	991
Monte Sereno	-	-	-	-	-
Morgan Hill	64	26	86	176	352
Mountain View	65	148	-	2,091	2,304
Palo Alto	-	2	-	35	37
San Jose	407	-	-	2,623	3,030
Santa Clara	-	6	60	1,311	1,377
Saratoga	-	-	-	-	-
Sunnyvale	76	59	118	1,399	1,652
Santa Clara County	624	243	281	8,881	10,029
Share of County Total	6%	2%	3%	89%	100%
Share of Regional Total	15%	8%	13%	21%	19%

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	64	26	3	93
Mountain View	65	148	-	213
Palo Alto	-	2	-	2
San Jose	407	-	-	407
Santa Clara	-	6	60	66
Saratoga	-	-	-	-
Sunnyvale	76	59	69	204
Santa Clara County	623	243	143	1,009
Share of County Total	62%	24%	14%	100%
Share of Regional Total	15%	8%	16%	12%

Solano County

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Benicia	-	-	4	2	6
Dixon	-	-	23	144	167
Fairfield	-	-	7	1,089	1,096
Rio Vista	-	-	3	272	275
Solano County	-	13	2	5	20
Suisun City	-	-	-	11	11
Vacaville	-	44	20	853	917
Vallejo	-	-	-	123	123
Solano County Total	-	57	59	2,499	2,615
Share of County Total	0%	2%	2%	96%	100%
Share of Regional Total	0%	1%	1%	4%	3%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Benicia	-	-	-	-	-
Dixon	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	2	132	134
Rio Vista	-	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	-	-	-
Suisun City	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	-	-	-	245	245
Vallejo	-	-	-	15	15
Solano County	-	-	2	392	394
Share of County Total	0%	0%	1%	99%	100%
Share of Regional Total	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Benicia	-	-	-	-
Dixon	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	1	1
Rio Vista	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	-	-
Suisun City	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	-	-	-	-
Vallejo	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	1	1
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	43	68
Cotati	5	4	2	47	58
Healdsburg	-	-	5	-	5
Petaluma	-	-	24	186	210
Rohnert Park	109	117	15	954	1,195
Santa Rosa	112	85	67	1,359	1,623
Sebastopol	35	4	2	20	61
Sonoma	40	17	29	66	152
Sonoma County	33	97	233	787	1,150
Windsor	30	29	1	30	90
Sonoma County Total	365	354	401	3,492	4,612
Share of County Total	8%	8%	9%	76%	100%
Share of Regional Total	7%	7%	10%	6%	6%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Cloverdale	1	-	-	11	12
Cotati	-	2	1	-	3
Healdsburg	-	-	-	-	-
Petaluma	-	-	3	70	73
Rohnert Park	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa	82	68	36	588	774
Sebastopol	31	2	2	8	43
Sonoma	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	24	35	4	120	183
Windsor	30	29	1	6	66
Sonoma County	168	136	47	803	1,154
Share of County Total	15%	12%	4%	70%	100%
Share of Regional Total	4%	4%	2%	2%	2%

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	82	67	19	168
Sebastopol	31	-	-	31
Sonoma	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	24	35	-	59
Windsor	30	29	1	60
Sonoma County	167	131	20	318
Share of County Total	0%	0%	0%	0%
Share of Regional Total	4%	4%	2%	4%

Regional Total

All New Units by Affordability Level					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Regional Total	5,143	4,738	3,992	61,524	75,397
Share of Regional Total	7%	6%	5%	82%	100%

New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TRAs)					
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Regional Total	4,289	3,178	2,127	42,515	52,109
Share of Regional Total	8%	6%	4%	82%	100%

New Deed-Restricted Units in PDAs or TRAs (HIP Eligible Units)				
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Regional Total	4,253	3,052	895	8,200
Share of Regional Total	52%	37%	11%	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 data is available.

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.