



Evaluation of First Round Awards Under California's Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing and Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Programs

Research conducted by Sharon Sprowls, Housing California
Editors: TOD/IIG Advisory Committee; Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group;
and Karen C. Naungayan, Housing California

I. Introduction

Proposition 1C, the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006, was passed by California voters in November 2006. Proposition 1C authorized the state to sell \$2.85 billion in general obligation bonds to fund 13 housing and development programs.

Housing California (Housing CA) was integrally involved in the drafting and passage of Proposition 1C, and thus has an ongoing interest in how well implementation meets our goals of increasing the supply of homes affordable to lower-income Californians and promoting effective transit-oriented and infill development.

As a result, Housing CA has begun assessing the outcomes of Proposition 1C-funded programs to determine the impact on California's housing supply, affordability, and other factors.

The Ford Foundation generously provided a grant to Housing CA to evaluate two new programs funded under Proposition 1C — the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program and the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program. This interim report represents our first step in evaluating the outcomes of these two programs, focusing on awards from the first round of program funding. After Round Two awards have been made, Housing CA will conduct a follow-up analysis and produce a more detailed report comparing outcomes from the first two funding rounds of each program.

II. Program Background

Proposition 1C included funds for these two, new housing-related programs, which are administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD):

1) **The Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program** — This program will provide a total of \$300 million in grants and loans to cities, counties, transit agencies, and developers to encourage transit-oriented development, namely, higher density uses in close proximity to transit stations. Funds may be used for costs of the housing development; infrastructure necessary to the housing development; capital improvements that enhance public pedestrian or bike access from the housing development(s) to the nearest transit station; and/or land acquisition by a redevelopment agency during the predevelopment period.

2) **The Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program** — This program will provide a total of \$790 million for infrastructure that supports urban infill housing development, including construction and/or improvement of streets and public transportation facilities, parks, water, and sewers. The IIG program has two application subcategories. One is for individual developments, or "Qualified Infill Projects" (QIPs). The other is for larger areas containing multiple housing developments, or "Qualified Infill Areas" (QIAs).

SB 1689 (Chapter 27, Statutes of 2006), which placed Proposition 1C on the ballot, established the Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program and general program guidelines. SB 86 (Chapter 179, Statutes of 2007) established the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program in law and provided initial guidelines for that program.

Building on this legislative guidance, staff of the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) conducted an input process with stakeholders to develop more detailed threshold and scoring criteria for the first funding round of each program. A summary of each program's first-round threshold eligibility requirements and scoring system is included in Appendices A and B.

Once all criteria were finalized, HCD issued a first-round Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the TOD Program on December 11, 2007, with applications due March 7, 2008. The NOFA for the IIG Program was issued on February 28, 2008, with applications due April 4, 2008.

HCD decided in Round One to allocate funds as follows:

- TOD Program: \$95 million total (later raised to \$145 million by the state legislature). Target of at least 45% of funds to Southern California and 30% to Northern California, with at least one award made in each of the four major council of government (COG) areas — Southern California, San Diego, the San Francisco Bay Area, and the Sacramento region.
- IIG Program: \$240 million total (later raised to \$340 million by the state legislature). Targeted 45% to Southern California counties, 10% to Central Valley counties, and 45% to Northern California counties.

The TOD Program received 59 applications requesting more than \$548 million in grants and loans. The IIG Program received 124 applications totaling \$1 billion. HCD staff reviewed and ranked the applications per the threshold and scoring criteria, rescoring applicants' self-scores as necessary.

A total of 16 TOD and 46 IIG awards (\$485 million in all) were announced by HCD in June 2008. Round One awards are listed in Appendices D and E.

III. Evaluation Methodology

To conduct this evaluation of first-round program awards, Housing CA organized an advisory committee of experts on transit-oriented and infill development from around the state. This committee, the TOD/IIG Advisory Committee, deliberately did not include participants who were actual or potential applicants for TOD or IIG funds. Advisory Committee members are listed in Appendix H.

Housing CA convened members of the Advisory Committee three times to review Round One program guidelines and award outcomes. The Advisory Committee gave input on which aspects of the program should be examined as well as potential alternate scoring systems to assess.

Between meetings, Housing CA staff gathered detailed information from the HCD grant applications, including the scope of proposed projects, location, cost, target population(s), numbers of homes and bedrooms, density, affordability, proximity to transit and amenities, whether the project was displacing existing homes, etc. Housing CA created several new databases and completed a variety of analyses of application data and scoring from both programs.

As Housing CA was undertaking this analysis, HCD began an effort to revise each program's guidelines for Round Two applications. HCD held stakeholder meetings and twice asked for public comment on new draft guidelines for Round Two grants.

Housing CA in the meantime was working on its analysis to determine outcomes of the Round One awards and outcomes that would have occurred under alternate scoring scenarios. Housing CA shared these findings with the TOD/IIG Advisory Committee, as well as members of Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group, composed of experts on affordable-home development and finance. Based on discussion by both groups, Housing CA submitted comments on HCD's proposed guideline revisions.

Additionally, Housing CA staff met with HCD staff to review the findings in depth and suggest program changes. In early 2009, HCD issued its Round Two guidelines for both programs, incorporating some of these proposed changes.

Findings from the Round One analysis are described in more detail in the following sections of this report.

IV. Glossary

The following are definitions of terms used in this report:

Affordable bedroom — A bedroom in an affordable home.

Affordable home — A home that is affordable to households earning less than a certain area median income. When used generally, refers to homes affordable to households with incomes at or below 80–120% of the area median income. Also known as a “below–market-rate” home.

Area median income (AMI) — The income level (in a defined area) at which half of the households earn more and half of the households earn less. Usually measured by county or metropolitan statistical area.

Car sharing — A system in which people pay a fee that gives them access to a shared vehicle or pool of vehicles, usually parked in an easily accessible location.

Extremely low income — A household with an income at or below 30% of the area median income.

General Plan — The state-mandated, comprehensive, long-term plan for the physical development of a city, county, or city and county. Essentially a local government's "blueprint" for development.

Headway or headway frequency — The time, usually expressed in minutes, between trips on the same transit route.

Home — An apartment, loft, condominium, town-home, single-family home, or other form of construction that is intended as a residence. May be rental or ownership.

Housing Element — One of seven required elements of a local government's General Plan, which specifies how the jurisdiction will meet its existing and projected housing needs.

Infill development — Development occurring in established areas that are already predominantly developed or urbanized. Infill development can occur on long-time vacant lots or on pieces of land with dilapidated buildings, or can involve changing the use of a property from a less to a more intensive use, such as a surface parking lot to family apartments.

Infrastructure — The network of communications and utility services such as roads, sewers, electricity, water, gas and telecommunication, needed to support an area that is developed.

Low income — A household with an income at or below 80% of the area median income.

Moderate income — A household with an income at or below 120% of the area median income.

Market-rate — A rental or for-sale home for which a landlord or developer, at his/her own discretion, determines how much to charge. Also refers to homes with no restrictions in the deed that limit the amount that can be charged for rent or a mortgage.

Mixed-use — A type of development that combines various uses, such as office, commercial, institutional, and residential, in a single building or on a single site.

Single-room occupancy (SRO) hotel — Multiple-tenant building that generally houses individuals in single rooms with shared bathrooms and/or kitchens. Although many are former hotels, SROs are primarily rented as permanent residences.

Transit-oriented development — A mixed-use residential or commercial area designed to maximize access to public transportation, and which often incorporates features to encourage transit ridership. A TOD neighborhood typically has a center with a train station, light rail station, tram stop, or bus stop surrounded by relatively high-density development. TODs generally are located within a radius of one-quarter to one-half mile from such a transit stop.

Transit-supportive amenities — Features that enhance and add to the value or desirability of a transit-oriented development, including stores, services, medical offices, libraries, parks, educational facilities, senior or youth programs, employment centers, etc. May also refer to features that facilitate pedestrian and bicycle travel to transit and other destinations, including benches, bike lanes, shade trees, crosswalks, and signals.

Very-low income — A household with an income at or below 50% of the area median income.

V. Round One: Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program Findings

A. Award Outcomes

The first round of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) grants (\$145 million) went to 16 projects with the following characteristics:

General

- Funds were divided 45% for Southern California and 55% for Northern California (List in Appendix D).
- Projects were awarded in the San Francisco Bay Area (7), Los Angeles (6), San Diego (2), and Sacramento (1).
- Three applicants were awarded the maximum amount of \$17 million.
- Four awards went to related projects: MacArthur Park A and B for a total of \$16,998,810; and Coliseum BART and Lion Creek Crossing for a total of \$16,012,592.
- Eight applicants were awarded funds for rental home development, five for associated infrastructure, and three to support both rental homes and infrastructure.
- One award was for rehabilitation of a former, single-room occupancy (SRO) hotel into affordable and market-rate lofts. All others were for new construction.
- Seven projects involve partnerships of for-profit and nonprofit developers. Five others are by for-profit developers and four by nonprofit developers.
- The requirement that at least one project be funded in each of the four largest council of government regions resulted in a Sacramento project being funded that would not have been funded based solely on scoring. Without the geographic targets, another San Francisco Bay Area project would have been funded.

TOD-Related Elements

- All awarded projects are located near heavy or light rail stations.
- Per HCD's definition, all have at least 10 transit-supportive amenities and services nearby.
- Eleven of the 16 are mixed-use projects. In addition to homes, uses range from child care, community and retail space to commercial and office space, hotel and entertainment uses.
- Five projects are solely residential, located in Oakland, Los Angeles, and San Diego.
- All awardees include residential parking. Five projects average from .1 to .8 spaces/unit; six have 1 space/unit; four average from 1.1 to 1.4 spaces per unit; and one did not specify.

Housing Characteristics

- Ten awarded projects are rental-only, while six include both ownership and rental homes.
- The ownership projects include only market-rate ownership homes.
- Nine are mixed-income projects.
- In six, affordable homes constitute 15% to 33% of total homes in the project, while eight of the awarded projects are 100% affordable.

The number of rental and for-sale homes to be produced and the affordability targeting are as follows:

	Total homes to be produced	Market-rate homes	Affordable homes	Extremely low income (at or below 30% AMI*)	Very-low income (at or below 50% AMI*)	Low income (at or below 80% AMI*)	Reserved for managers
Number	3,608	1,821	1,771	491	869	411	16
% of total	100%	50.5%	49.5%	13.6%	24.1%	11.4%	0.4%

* AMI = Area Median Income

B. Scoring

In Round One, most of the awardees received full points in the bulk of the 31 categories. Any significant differentiation between applicants came primarily from the following seven scoring criteria:

- 1(a)(1) — peak period/on-time performance of transit serving the site
- 1(a)(5) — population density within a 4-mile radius of the nearby transit station
- 1(f)(1) — project's parking charged separately to tenants
- 1(f)(2) — free or discounted transit passes provided to residents
- 1(f)(3) — shares parking with other on-site uses
- 1(f)(1) — offers car share spaces
- 1(g) — level of project readiness
- 1(k) — project size (received additional points for 100–199 units or 200+ units)

C. Home Production with Alternative TOD Scoring Criteria

At the request of the Advisory Committee and HCD, Housing CA analyzed how the use of alternative criteria to those in Round One would have affected housing production. Housing CA staff ran six different scenarios, as shown in Table 1 on the following pages.

These scenarios provide an idea of how scoring system changes might have affected Round One outcomes. However, alternate scenarios could only be based on actual applications. It is not possible to determine how scoring differences might have affected the entire applicant pool for Round One funds.

Table 1: Home affordability outcomes of 2008 TOD grant recipients, and comparison with alternate scoring scenarios

TOD Grants as awarded June 2008	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	491	869	411	0	1,821	16	3,608	1,771	2,996
% of total homes	13.6%	24.1%	11.4%	0.0%	50.5%	0.4%		49%	
Alternative Scenarios:									
#1) Eliminate project size points	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	570	809	411	0	1,159	17	2,966	1,790	3,058
% of total homes	19.2%	27.3%	13.9%	0.0%	39.1%	0.6%		60%	
#2) Substitute new, tiered project size points (15/20/25/30)	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	527	922	529	0	1,821	19	3,818	1,978	3,441
% of total homes	13.8%	24.1%	13.9%	0.0%	47.4%	0.5%		51.8%	
#3) Double Round One affordability point awards, keep Round One project size points	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	665	869	411	55	1,939	17	3,956	2,000	3,403
% of total homes	16.8%	22.0%	10.4%	1.4%	49.0%	0.4%		51%	
#4) Double Round One affordability point awards, eliminate project size points	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	600	756	529	0	950	19	2,854	1,885	3,075
% of total homes	21.0%	26.5%	18.5%	0.0%	33.3%	0.7%		66%	

Note: Shading indicates highest number for that category

Table 1 (continued)

#5) Raise cap from 30 to 60 points for affordability	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	626	762	411	0	1,022	16	2,837	1,799	2,854
% of total homes	22.1%	26.9%	14.5%	0.0%	36.0%	0.6%		63.4%	
#6) Raise affordability cap to 60 points, use new tiered project size points (15/20/25/30)	Extremely low income (30% AMI)	Very-low income (50% AMI)	Low income (80% AMI)	Moderate income (120% AMI)	Market rate	Mgr units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total affordable bedrooms
Total homes	635	752	442	0	822	17	2,668	1,829	2,881
% of total homes	23.8%	28.2%	16.6%	0.0%	30.8%	0.6%		68.6%	

Note: Shading indicates highest number for that category

D. Alternative Scenarios

Project Size Points

As shown in Table 1, Housing CA compared the effects of different project size scoring systems. Scenario #1 shows the impact of eliminating the Round One size points in 108(k) for projects of 100+ and 200+ units. Without project size points, the number of homes produced rises for those with extremely low incomes (30% or less of AMI). Eliminating size points also increases the total number of affordable homes and affordable bedrooms. However the number of homes drops for those with very-low incomes (50% of AMI), as do the number of market-rate homes and homes overall.

For Round Two, HCD proposed (and eventually adopted) a shift in the project size criteria to a 15/20/25/30 point scale for projects from 50–200+ units. In comparison with using the original project size points or eliminating size points altogether, the tiered point scale shown in Scenario #2 would have produced the same number of market-rate homes as awarded projects, but more affordable homes and bedrooms.

Affordability and Project Size Points

Housing CA also tested changes in affordability points. First, staff ran two scenarios in which the original affordability points were simply doubled from those awarded to Round One applicants. In one of these alternate scenarios, the original project size points were kept, while in the other the project size points were eliminated.

As shown in Table 1, Scenario #3, which included doubled affordability points and Round One project size points, yielded the most homes and affordable homes overall. Scenario #3 produced the greatest number of homes for those with extremely low, moderate, and market-rate incomes. This scoring combination would have produced the same number of homes as the June 2008 awardees for very-low and low income households. It would also have yielded a larger number of affordable bedrooms — although fewer than the tiered point size scenario.

Scenario #4 doubles the awarded affordability points but removes any project size points. In this scenario, the number of homes targeted to those with extremely low incomes exceeds those produced by the awardees or the tiered size point scenario. Scenario #4 yields the same number of homes targeted to those with 80% of AMI as the tiered size point scenario.

Finally, as shown in Scenario #5, Housing CA calculated the homes produced by raising the affordability point cap from 30 to 60 points. Scenario #6 included both the raised point cap for affordability, and the new tiered size points. Both Scenarios #5 and #6 would likely have produced fewer homes in several categories. However, compared with awardees, the 60-point affordability scenario raised the number of homes for those with extremely low incomes, met or exceeded the number for those with low incomes, and increased the total number of affordable homes.

Alternative Scenarios: Summary

Of the alternatives tested, the tiered project size points yielded the greatest number of homes for those with very-low and low incomes, and the most affordable bedrooms. By contrast, doubling the affordability points resulted in the greatest number of homes overall, and the greatest number of affordable homes, rentals for those with extremely low incomes (30% of AMI), and homes for those with moderate incomes (up to 120% of AMI).

E. Issues Raised by the Advisory Committee and Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group

The following section summarizes the more detailed critique of the Round One TOD award criteria and scoring system, as provided by the Advisory Committee and Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group. It includes initial suggested revisions, plus areas proposed for further discussion and refinement for future funding rounds.

Catalyst Projects

Advisory Committee members suggested that TOD is still not a very common practice, and that the program should try to reward TOD projects that are catalysts for better development. Advisors noted that site visits would provide a better idea of the context and potential for a project to be a true catalyst, but agreed that it would take more work to develop any standardized scoring system that could capture what constitutes a catalyst project.

Affordable-Home Stock and Gentrification

Advisors were concerned with gentrification fostered by TOD projects, especially near rail stations. They wanted to see applicants demonstrate that they have credible tools in place to prevent significant gentrification effects.

Advisors were particularly concerned with providing state funds to projects that did not increase the supply of homes, particularly affordable homes, or to projects that create a net loss of homes and affordability. The discussion was occasioned by a developer who received a TOD award to rehabilitate a former single-room occupancy (SRO) hotel. Prior to the application, the owner had emptied the building, closing 297 SRO apartments. The awarded project will produce 38 market-rate, one-bedroom lofts and 259 studio lofts (102 targeted to those at 35% of AMI, and 159 at 60% of AMI). Advisors were concerned with whether the rehabilitated lofts would be affordable to previous tenants and with the net loss of 38 affordable studios in downtown Los Angeles — a prime area for gentrification despite the large number of people who are homeless.

Advisors pointed out that — according to exit polls — Proposition 1C was passed by voters who wanted more affordable homes built, so people would not be living on the street. Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group members recommended a doubling of points for affordability. Advisors wanted to see HCD's threshold and scoring criteria better capture applicant projects' history and effects on overall housing stock and affordability. They did want to make rehabilitation of existing homes that are unacceptably substandard or not fit for human habitation an eligible use. Yet, they were concerned with rewarding projects that actually reduce the net stock of affordable homes, do not contribute new net affordable homes, or replace affordable homes off-site and further from transit. They thought a negative point system, similar to that for developer poor- or non-performance, might be possible for projects that are ultimately reducing the net stock of affordable homes. Advisors also wanted to insure that projects provide a 1-1 replacement affordable to the same income level as that of the tenants who would be displaced.

Environmental Justice

Advisors recommended the program consider requiring applicants to disclose siting near any properties with undesirable land uses, significant air emissions, or toxic contamination so that the environmental justice impacts of applicant projects could be assessed.

102 – Transit Definitions

Section 102(aa) defines “Transit Station” as a “rail or light-rail station, ferry terminal, Bus Hub or Bus Transfer Station,” including planned transit stations. Section 102(u) of the TOD Guidelines defines a “Qualifying Transit Station” as a “Transit Station which qualifies a Housing Development for the award of Program funds and where the transit service serving the Transit Station provides weekday, evening, and weekend services.”

Advisors found the transit-related definitions in Section 102 somewhat unclear. As all initial awarded projects were located near heavy or light rail, members suggested the program consider whether Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), bus transfer stations, major bus corridors, and bus hubs can still be competitive. If the program ever expands to smaller town centers, advisors also suggested setting up separate subprograms in which large, urbanized centers and smaller town centers could compete among themselves.

105(c)(3) – Funding Limits

Section 105(c)(3) states, "Housing Developments not containing Incremental Units shall be ineligible to receive Program funding if receiving either a nine-percent tax credit allocation from [the Tax Credit Allocation Committee] TCAC or receiving an award of MHP funds." Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group members recommended deleting this restriction so that tax-credit and MHP-funded projects without incremental units could qualify. TOD developments are inherently expensive, and those that most fully meet TOD Program objectives — dense, affordable, urban infill developments — are the most expensive to build. Typical additional development costs include environmental remediation, complicated entitlement processes involving multiple public agencies, structured parking facilities, and difficult construction staging conditions. Advisory Committee members recommended allowing full layering of TOD program funds with nine-percent tax credits and MHP funds to facilitate the feasibility of such transit-oriented developments.

108(a)(1) – Transit Frequency

Section 108(a)(1) states, "A maximum of 30 points shall be assigned to applications in which the best performing mode of transit serving the Qualified Transit Station has peak period headway

frequency of twelve minutes or less. Scoring for all other applications will be determined by the best performing primary mode of transit demonstrating all day, on-time arrival/departure performance as set forth below:

Points	Rail	Bus/Ferry
30	>95%	>90%
25	90-94.99%	85-89.99%
20	85-89.99%	80-84.99%
0	<85%	<80%

Advisors felt that the focus for a transit frequency measure should be how easy it is to get on a transit vehicle from the project location. The Advisory Committee recommended there be a more detailed, standardized point system measuring transit frequency over the course of the day, not just during peak hours. This measure would include all forms of transit — heavy rail, light rail, BRT, bus, and ferry. Such a measure might look at how many transit vehicles serve nearby stops, stops per day, vehicles per hour, seats per hour, and/or other factors, with applicants perhaps obtaining assistance from their local council of government to perform calculations.

Advisors did not see on-time performance as an effective measure of transit frequency. They noted that if there are good headways or many relatively frequent routes in an area, it does not matter so much if the transit service is late because there is service still available on numerous routes. The point system also seemed arbitrary in rewarding 80% on-time performance with 20 points, but 79% on-time performance with 0 points, with no clear basis for that dividing line.

Advisors noted it would be a benefit if the TOD program had the additional outcome of incentivizing increases in transit frequency and availability.

108(a)(5) – Population Density Near Transit

Section 108(a)(5) awards points based on population density of the area within a 4-mile radius of the Qualifying Transit Station. Some members of the Advisory Committee suggested looking at how this radius measure affects coastal communities, which have the ocean as part of their circle for measuring residential density.

108(b) – Project Location

Section 108(b) awarded points for projects located in an area designated for infill development in a COG regional plan, or for transit-oriented development in one of a number of specified local plans. The Advisory Committee suggested the program consider if such location should become a threshold criteria rather than including it in the scoring criteria.

108(d) – Transit-Supportive Land Uses/Amenities

Section 108(d) required applicants to identify and list in their application any of 23 specified “transit-supportive amenities and services” within a 1/2-mile of the Qualifying Transit Station. Ten distinct amenities and services received 10 points.

Advisors noted that, depending on the target population for a TOD project, some of the listed amenities in Section 108(d), such as a child care or a senior care facility, might not offer services that residents would find useful. Additionally, amenities have different values in promoting transit usage. The Advisory Committee wanted to develop a more effective measure to capture amenities and services in relation to planned residents, and perhaps to include a more tiered point structure for available amenities.

108(e) – Walkability

Section 108(e) awarded points based on the extent to which the application demonstrated specified features in the primary walkable corridor between the housing development and the Qualifying Transit Station.

Advisory Committee members noted that walkability measures focused solely on the trip between the homes and the transit station, but not on walking access to nearby amenities. The Advisory Committee felt it would be better to develop a more comprehensive measure of walking access to assess the walkability of the neighborhood beyond just the trip to transit. This could include utilizing or building on existing walkability indices.

108(f)(2) – Transit Passes

Section 108(f)(2) stated, “Four points will be assigned to applications where Housing Developments provide to residents free transit passes or discounted passes priced at no more than half of retail cost. At least one transit pass shall be made available to each Restricted Unit for the term of the Program loan.”

Advisory Committee members felt that the wording of this scoring criteria was unclear as to what was expected to qualify for points: Did this mean one free or discounted monthly pass for each resident for each month of the term of the HCD loan? Would a one-day pass each month qualify? What about one pass total to each resident? Members recommended that HCD make the transit pass requirement very specific. They also felt that HCD should hold developers accountable for this provision since these points could make the difference between receiving an award or not.

Another issue with the transit pass criteria was raised by members of Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group. Some affordable homebuilders who applied to the TOD program included no parking at all, because their targeted residents are already transit users. If there are heavily subsidized, 100% affordable projects with no parking, they questioned whether it was reasonable to expect nonprofit developers to provide transit passes to residents who are already transit users, or lose these scoring points. However, some Advisory Committee members noted studies have shown that people who are low-income and transit-dependent travel more frequently when provided free passes, since they otherwise limit trips to reduce their direct transit expenditures. This was considered an area for further discussion.

108(f)(3) – Shared Parking

Section 108(f)(3) awarded two points to “applications where the Housing Development provides parking that will be shared between different uses, such as parking that serves housing residents at night and retail customers by day.”

Some advisors were concerned that residential-only projects would have no chance of receiving these points.

108(f)(4) – Car Sharing

Section 108(f)(4) awarded two points to “applications where the Housing Development provides dedicated parking spaces for shared vehicle only parking.”

All awarded projects said they intended to include spaces for car sharing. Advisors noted there will probably be a need for more incentives for residents to actually car-share, since it is not a widespread practice now.

108(f)(5) – Maximum Parking

Section 108(f)(5) stated, “Seven points will be assigned to applications for Projects which provide for no more than the following maximum parking spaces excluding park-and-ride and transit station replacement parking.

Project location designation	Bedrooms per unit	Maximum resident and guest parking spaces per unit
Large city	0–1	1.0
Downtown	2+	1.5
Urban	0-1	1.25
Center	2+	1.75
All other	0–1	1.5
Areas	2+	2.0

Some project awardees had the maximum allowed spaces per unit while other unsuccessful applicants planned no parking at all. Since the goal of TOD is to encourage transit use, Advisory Committee members felt that applicants should be rewarded with more points the fewer parking spaces they will provide. They also felt that the availability of state TOD funding should encourage local governments to waive their ordinary minimum parking requirements for TOD projects.

Some Advisory Committee members suggested that some of the parking maximums were set too high. Members also suggested that rather than providing a fixed number of points for parking spaces per unit, a sliding scale should be used to reward those with less parking than the specified maximums. However, some Land Use and Finance Working Group members pointed out that since local governments set parking standards, it can be difficult for some projects to reduce parking even if desired. This was also considered an area for further discussion.

108(k) - Project Size and Density

Section 108(k) awarded 15 points to housing developments with 100–199 homes, and 20 points to those with 200 or more homes. Advisory Committee members noted the benefit of very dense development near transit. However, Round One’s scoring for total numbers of units did not effectively capture project density benefits. For example, a project with 50 homes on a 1/2-acre site provides much greater density than 100 homes on a 2-acre site, but under the Round One scoring system in 108(k), only the 100-unit project was rewarded. Furthermore, a 100-apartment project that is exclusively studios will have a lower residential density than a 100-apartment project with all 2- and 3-bedroom units.

The Advisory Committee suggested greater tiering of points for project size. They were also particularly interested in developing a scoring mix of project size, land, and bedroom measures to more fully capture residential density, while acknowledging that different places merit different amounts of density. This could include a measure reflecting numbers of bedrooms that would reward proposed homes with more than 2–3 bedrooms, especially rentals, since these are scarce but needed by larger families.

VI. Round One: Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program Findings

A. Award Outcomes

The Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program awarded 46 first-round grants: 13 to larger “Qualified Infill Areas” (QIAs) for a total of \$241 million, and 33 to individual “Qualified Infill Projects” (QIPs) for a total of \$99 million. (See Appendix E for complete list.)

The first round of IIG awards went to projects with the following characteristics:

General

- Funds were divided 45% to Southern California, 45% to Northern California, and 10% to the Central Valley.
- Among the projects, 18 were awarded in Los Angeles/Southern California, 14 in the San Francisco Bay Area, four in the Central Valley, four in the Sacramento area, and three in the San Diego area.
- Two applicants were awarded the maximum amount of \$30 million.
- Five QIAs and one QIP also received a TOD grant.
- Applicants were a mix of public agencies and nonprofit and for-profit developers. Of the awarded project sponsors:
 - 17 are nonprofits.
 - Eight are for-profits.
 - Three are partnerships between a for-profit and a nonprofit.
 - Six are public agencies.
 - Six are partnerships between public agencies and one or more nonprofit developers; five between public agencies and for-profit developers; and one is between a city, a nonprofit and a for-profit developer.
- Without geographic targets, more projects would likely have been funded in Southern California.

Housing Characteristics

- The QIPs will provide much more affordability than the QIAs. Thirty of the 33 awarded QIPs are 100% affordable, while only one QIA project has 100% affordability.
- Eleven of the 13 QIAs and two of the 33 QIPs include both ownership and rental homes.
- Two of the QIP projects have for-sale homes only.
- Two of the QIA and 29 of the QIP projects include rentals only.
- Nine of the 13 QIAs will offer one-third or less of their homes as affordable.
- Two of the QIAs and two of the QIPs offer ownership homes to those with incomes up to 80% of AMI.
- Three of the QIAs and one of the QIPs include ownership homes for up to 120% of AMI.

For the IIG Program, scoring criteria were not sufficiently broken down to allow the development of alternate scenarios. However, Housing CA staff was able to calculate the number of affordable homes and the income targeting produced by grant recipients under the QIP and QIA subprograms.

The total number of rental and for-sale homes to be produced and the affordability targeting are as follows:

	Number of awards	% of all IIG funds	Total homes	Total market-rate homes	Total affordable homes	Affordable homes as % of all homes	Total affordable rental homes	Affordable ownership homes (80% AMI)	Affordable ownership homes (120% AMI)
QIAs	13	71%	6,992	4,724	2,258	32%	2,205	18	35
QIPs	33	29%	2,913	297	2,568	88%	2,458	45	65

* AMI = Area Median Income

The QIPs received 29% of the total grant funds. Compared with the QIAs' proposed residential developments, the QIPs will contribute a larger number of affordable homes. As shown in the following table, the QIPs will also produce:

- 34% of all bedrooms.
- 7% of market-rate bedrooms, but 56% of all affordable bedrooms.

	Total bedrooms	Total market-rate bedrooms	Total affordable bedrooms
QIAs	8,908	5,564	3,344
% of total	66%	93%	44%
QIPs	4,618	392	4,226
% of total	34%	7%	56%

Based on applications, when averaged across the number of affordable homes, awards differ considerably between QIAs and QIPs:

	Grant award per home overall	Grant award averaged per affordable home
QIAs	\$34,461.03	\$106,710.16
QIPs	\$34,002.22	\$38,570.27

B. Issues Raised by the Advisory Committee and Housing CA's Land Use and Finance Working Group

The following section summarizes the more detailed critique provided by the Advisory Committee of the Round One IIG criteria and scoring system, including areas proposed for further discussion and refinement in future funding rounds.

Funding Split

In Round One, the IIG program allocated 71% of funds to QIAs and 29% to QIPs. As noted, the QIPs will provide significantly more affordability than QIAs. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that HCD allocate a greater share of IIG funds to QIPs than QIAs in Round Two

— especially in light of the economic downturn and likelihood of greater readiness among developers of specific infill projects vs. developers of large infill areas.

302(l) and (d) – Major Transit Stop and Bus Hub

Section 302(l) defined a “Major Transit Stop” as a “bus, ferry or rail stop served by either:

(1) one route departing nine (six for Localities with minimum Net Densities of 15 units per acre or less pursuant to Paragraph 303(a)(4)) or more times between both 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., inclusive, and 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., inclusive, Monday through Friday; or

(2) two or more routes departing 12 (eight for Localities with minimum Net Densities of 15 units per acre or less pursuant to Paragraph 303(a)(4)) or more times between both 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., inclusive, and 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., inclusive, Monday through Friday.”

Section 302(d) defined “Bus Hub” as “an intersection of three or more bus routes, where one route or a combination of routes has a minimum scheduled headway of 10 minutes or at least six buses per hour” during weekday peak hours (7:00–10:00 am and 3:00–7:00 pm).

Land Use and Finance Working Group members were concerned that these definitions limited the competitiveness of smaller towns with good proposed infill projects and available transit service. As with the TOD program, Housing CA and the Advisory Committee want to work further on definitions and scoring measures of transit frequency and access.

303(a)(2) – Housing Element

Section 303(a)(2) of the threshold criteria required that the jurisdiction have an adopted Housing Element of their General Plan that has been determined by HCD to be in substantial compliance with legal requirements. Advisors suggested going further and looking at scoring that also rewards projects that specifically meet needs identified in the locality’s Housing Element.

308(e) and 309(e) – Proximity to Amenities

The “proximity to amenities” scoring in Sections 308(e) and 309(e) of the Infill Infrastructure Grant program guidelines differed from the TOD scoring system. The IIG scoring criteria awarded points for specified proximity to parks, employment and retail centers, schools, colleges, social services, and senior facilities, but not necessarily neighborhood-serving businesses. As with the TOD program, the Advisory Committee suggested developing a scoring measure to capture the appropriate range of amenities and services that would best serve the project’s residents and employees of the non-residential uses within the infill area/project.

308(e) and 309(e) – Size Definitions of Employment and Retail Centers

In the scoring for proximity to amenities:

- Sections 308(e)(2) and 309(e)(1)(B) defined a “locally recognized employment center” as a “recognized concentration of employment opportunities such as a large hospital, industrial park, commercial district, or office area.”
- Sections 308(e)(3) and 309(e)(1)(C) define a “locally recognized retail center” as “a downtown area or recognized neighborhood or regional shopping mall.”

Both employment and retail centers are supposed to have a minimum of 50 full-time employees.

Advisors questioned the 50-employee definition, which did not seem to correspond with the idea of a large employment or retail center such as a hospital or regional shopping mall. The Advisory Committee recommended developing a definition or employee measure that is consistent with the scale of desired amenities, i.e.:

- An employment center that would be a likely place of employment for residents of the infill homes that are developed;
- Retail centers that would be a draw for both residents of the infill homes and employees at any of the non-residential uses within the infill area/project.

VII. Round One: Issues Raised by the Advisory Committee Concerning Both Programs

The following were issues and concerns raised by the Advisory Committee that relate to both the TOD and IIG programs:

Infrastructure Type

Advisors raised concerns about the type of infrastructure that was being funded. While the hope for infill development is to encourage walking, biking, and transit use, some of the infrastructure funding was awarded to support street widening and highway on-ramps. HCD staff noted that only infrastructure projects that were required by the city or county (as a condition for city/county project approval) were eligible for funding. There were also concerns with whether recipients could change how they spent infrastructure dollars after receiving the award to such uses, or away from infrastructure to improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access.

Profitability

Section 105(f)(5) of the TOD guidelines and Section 305(c) of the IIG guidelines required that applicants demonstrate that the grant does not result in the developer(s) benefiting from the infrastructure by “realizing a profit that exceeds the commercially reasonable range for other developments of similar size and level of risk.” Advisors suggested looking at how unreasonable profit levels in for-profit developments could be adequately determined. HCD staff noted the department uses uniform guidelines on developer fees as a benchmark and requires developers to justify profits that exceed those amounts.

Application Process

It was suggested that HCD streamline and clarify the application process, so that in subsequent rounds, applicants would not be submitting such large binders of information (overwhelming for both applicants and HCD staff), and would be clear on how to submit applications, especially for projects with multiple aspects or phases.

Project Partners

The Advisory Committee also suggested the programs consider rewarding projects with special types of partners, such as employers for employer-assisted housing projects.

Award Cap

Some Advisory Committee and Land Use and Finance Working Group members expressed interest in seeing a limit on the amount individual applicants could receive under each program.

Enforcement

The Advisory Committee wanted assurance that HCD will ensure that what was scored and promised in each awarded application is completed/enforced. HCD staff noted the department specifies these terms in the award contracts and also conducts annual project inspections to verify compliance. This includes confirming the number of homes created, affordability levels, offering of transit passes, and that the amenities and infrastructure are built to support walkability and transit access.

VIII. Round Two: Revisions to Both Programs and Further Evaluation

In early 2009, HCD adopted new guidelines for both the TOD and IIG programs that addressed a number of concerns from Round One. A summary of revised Round Two eligibility and scoring criteria may be found in Appendices F and G.

Awards for Round Two of each program were approved in June 2009. Housing CA plans to conduct a similar analysis of Round Two final grant awards, and issue another more detailed report. This will compare Round One and Round Two outcomes, assess the impact of guideline revisions between rounds, and suggest potential revisions to guidelines for any future rounds.

View the Executive Summary

An executive summary of this report, "Evaluation of First Round Awards Under California's Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing and Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Programs", is available on the Housing CA website: www.housingca.org/resources/execsumm_tod-iig_round-one_eval_2009.pdf.

Appendix A

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) First Round Criteria

For complete guidelines, see:

http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/tod/TOD_Housing_Program_Guidelines.pdf

Key Threshold Requirements

To be eligible, a housing development had to:

- Consist of new construction or substantial rehabilitation or conversion of non-residential structure(s) to residences, with at least 50 rental and/or homeownership housing units.
- Be located within one of 27 specified urbanized areas.
- Be located within 1/4-mile of a Qualifying Transit Station (e.g., heavy or light rail station, bus rapid transit station, bus transfer station, bus hub).
- Restrict a minimum of 15% of the housing units to low- or very-low-income residents.
- Have a density of at least 25–60 units/acre (based on location).

To be eligible, an infrastructure project had to provide substantial benefit to one such housing development, and include:

- Capital improvements required by a local government entity, transit agency, or special district as a condition for building the housing development; and/or
- Capital improvements that substantially enhance pedestrian or bicycle access between the housing development and the nearest transit station.

Applicant Scoring

108(a) Extent project will increase public transit ridership, minimize auto trips		110
(1) Peak period frequency of 12 minutes or less, or specified on-time performance.	20–30	
(2) Specified travel time ratio: transit vs. auto.	15–20	
(3) Electronic user information at transit station.	4	
(4) Current schedules and maps posted at transit station.	1	
(5) Population density within 4-mile radius of transit station.	19–55	
108(b) Location in area designated for infill or TOD		40
(1) Designated for infill development through a COG regional plan policy	20	
(2) In an area designated for TOD in one/more specified plans.	10	
(3) Evidence of coordinated public/private investment.	10	
108(c) Affordability		30
Percentage of rental or ownership homes to be developed that will be restricted to occupancy by various income groups.	.13–30	

108(d) Transit-supportive land use		15
At least 10 distinct transit-supportive amenities within 1/2 mile.	15	
108(e) Extent project incorporates walkable corridor features		25
(1) No more than 25% of street blocks exceed 500 ft in length.	5	
(2) Corridor fully served by continuous paved, American Disabilities Act–compliant sidewalks.	5	
(3) Safe pedestrian crossing of any arterials between housing development and transit station.	5	
(4) Station with waiting facilities with lighting and overhead shelter.	5	
(5) Corridor is adequately lighted for pedestrians after dark.	5	
108(f) Parking		20
(1) Housing development parking is charged separately and covers costs.	5	
(2) Residents to receive at least one free/discounted transit pass for term of loan period.	4	
(3) Shares parking between different uses.	2	
(4) Dedicates parking spaces for car share vehicles.	2	
(5) Meets specified maximum parking spaces for location and bedrooms.	7	
108(g) Readiness		30
(1) Enforceable commitments for all construction period funding.	8	
(2) Completion of draft or all environmental clearances.	4 or 7	
(3) All necessary and discretionary land use approvals excluding building permits and other ministerial approvals.	8	
(4) Has one of the following: developer has fee title ownership or long-term leasehold; local design review approval obtained or not required; or all deferred payment grants and subsidies committed as allowed by Tax Credit Allocation Committee.	7	
108(h) Leverage of permanent development funds over TOD funds > 100%		15
Permanent development funding as percent of requested program funds.	.75 points for each 10% increment over 100%	
108(i) Developer past performance		30
(1) Large/similar infill developments by applicant in past 5 years.	10 each	
(2) Project is a joint development and developer has done a successful one in the last 5 years.	10	
(3) Deductions for specified non- or poor performance.	-5 each (up to -50)	
108(j) Community support through a documented, inclusive process		15
108(k) Project size		30
(1) 200 or more residential units.	30	
(2) 100–199 residential units.	15	

Maximum Points Possible**350**

Appendix B

Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program

Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

First Round Criteria

For complete guidelines, see

http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/iig/IIG_Guidelines_022808.pdf

Key Threshold Requirements

To be eligible, a capital improvement project had to be an integral part of, or necessary to facilitate, the development of a “Qualifying Infill Project” (QIP) or “Qualifying Infill Area” (QIA). The QIP or QIA must:

- Be located within an urbanized area.
- Be in a locality with an adopted Housing Element (required part of the city/county General Plan) found by the state to be in substantial compliance with state Housing Element requirements.
- Develop a minimum of 15% of the housing units as affordable (no more than 60% of area median income for rentals, or 120% of area median income for ownership).
- Have average, minimum net densities above or equal to California’s Housing Element default densities for accommodating lower-income households (10–30 units/acre, depending on location).
- Be in an area designated for mixed-use or residential development.
- Meet one of three definitions of “infill.” (See Appendix C for definitions.)

A QIA also had to include within its boundaries a QIP that does not contain more than 50% of the total housing units proposed for the QIA and that has received all land use entitlements or has a complete application pending before the appropriate jurisdiction

A QIP had to be a discrete development with a common development scheme and common or related ownership and financing.

Applicant Scoring — Qualifying Infrastructure Area (QIA)

309(a) Readiness	30
(1) Adopted, certified, or draft program, master, or tiered environmental impact report (EIR); or not less than 50% of QIA land area on sites that have been subject to Phase I Site Assessment within prior one year.	2–8
(2) All necessary and discretionary land use approvals granted for not less than 1/2 or 1/3 of housing units proposed for development in QIA; QIA is subject to general, specific, redevelopment area, community or other area-specific plan, and housing is consistent with plan; or all approvals granted for Community Improvement Project (CIP) within QIA.	2–8
(3) Committed construction funding for residential units and/or CIP; documentation of interest or intent to fund CIP.	2–8

(4) Local support: City Council/Board of Supervisors letter of support; at least 50% of residential units on site(s) in Housing Element; or local funding commitment(s) for CIP for at least 25% of grant amount.	6	
309(b) Affordability		30
Percentage of rental or ownership homes to be developed in the QIA that will be restricted to occupancy by various income groups.	1–30	
309(c) Adjusted net density as percentage of required density		20
300% or more	20	
250–299.9%	15	
200–249.9%	10	
150–199.9%	7.5	
110–149.9%	5	
Less than 110%	0	
309(d) Access to transit		20
Percentage of residential units in QIA within 1/2-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop, relative to total residential units in QIA.	2 per each 10%	
309(e) Proximity to specified amenities within QIA or 1/2 mile of QIA boundary		20
6 or more amenities per 10 acres.	20	
2 to 5 amenities per 10 acres.	10	
309(f) Consistency with COG Regional Blueprint or Growth Plan		10
Maximum Points Possible		130

Applicant Scoring — Qualifying Infill Project (QIP)

308(a) Readiness		30
(1) Completion of all necessary environmental clearances; issuance of public notice of availability of draft environmental impact report (EIR), negative declaration, or environmental assessment, or Phase I/II Site Assessment within one year prior to application and approved remediation plan.	2–8	
(2) All necessary discretionary land use approvals granted; or consistent with local plans, zoning ordinances and applications submitted for all necessary discretionary local land use approvals.	2–8	
(3) Committed construction period funding for QIP and/or Community Improvement Project (CIP).	4–8	
(4) Local support — one of following: City Council/Board of Supervisors/Planning Department support letter; QIP is on site designated or identified in Housing Element; has all discretionary local land use approvals and local public funding commitments; or funding commitment(s) for CIP equaling at least 25% of requested grant amount.	6	

308(b) Affordability		30
Percentage of rental or ownership homes to be developed in the QIA that will be restricted to occupancy by various income groups.	.13–30	
308(c) Adjusted net density as percentage of required density		20
150% or more	20	
140–149.9%	15	
130–149.9%	10	
120–129.9%	7.5	
110–119.9%	5	
308(d) Access to Transit		20
(1) Within 1/2-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop.	20	
(2) Within 1-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop.	10	
308(e) Proximity to specified amenities		20
(1) Within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of public park (1/2 mile or 1 mile for rural projects).	6 or 4	
(2) Within 1 or 2 miles of locally recognized employment center with minimum 50 full-time employees (2 or 4 miles for rural area projects).	7 or 4	
(3) Within 1 or 2 miles of locally recognized retail center with minimum 50 full-time employees (2 or 4 miles for rural area projects).	7 or 4	
(4) If 50% of QIP residences have 2 or more bedrooms, is within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of public school/community college (1/2 or 1 mile for rural areas).	7 or 4	
(5) If project provides special needs, single-room occupancy (SRO), or supportive housing, is within 1/2 or 1 mile of social service facility that serves residents of QIP.	7 or 4	
(6) If project is senior housing, is within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of senior center or senior service facility (1/2 mile or 1 mile for rural projects)	7 or 4	
308(f) Consistency with COG Regional Blueprint or Growth Plan		10
Maximum Points Possible		130

Appendix C

Infill Definition for "Qualified Infill Areas" (QIAs) or "Qualified Infill Projects" (QIPs)
from page 7, http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/iig/IIG_Guidelines_022808.pdf

(6) Have any of the following:

(A) at least 75% of the area included within the Qualifying Infill Project or Qualifying Infill Area as previously improved (including areas where improvements have been demolished) or used for any use other than open space, agriculture, forestry, or mining waste storage; or

(B) at least 75% of the perimeter of the Qualifying Infill Project or Qualifying Infill Area adjoining parcels that are developed with Urban Uses, or is separated from parcels that are developed with Urban Uses only by an improved public right-of-way. In calculating this percentage, perimeters bordering navigable bodies of water and improved parks shall not be included; or

(C) the combination of at least 50% of the area included within the Qualifying Infill Project or Qualifying Infill Area as previously improved (including areas where improvements have been demolished) or used for any use other than open space, agriculture, forestry or mining waste storage, and at least 50% of the perimeter of the Qualifying Infill Project or Qualifying Infill Area adjoining parcels that are developed with Urban Uses, or is separated from parcels that are developed with Urban Uses only by an improved public right-of-way. In calculating this percentage, perimeters bordering navigable bodies of water and improved parks shall not be included.

Appendix D

Round One: 16 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Program Awards (June 2008)

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	TOD Award	Funding Type	COG
Grand Avenue Apartments	The Related Companies, LP	98 affordable rentals, 60 parking spaces, as part of a mixed-use, mixed-income, high-rise development, also including market-rate condos, retail and hotel uses. Near Metro Red Line Civic Center station, DASH and Express service.	Los Angeles	\$9,599,102	Rental Homes	SCAG
Rossllyn Lofts	Amerland	Acquisition/rehabilitation of a 297-unit former SRO hotel in downtown L.A. into 7 floors of multifamily rentals, 3 floors of market-rate lofts, 33 parking spaces, with community room and ground floor retail.	Los Angeles	\$6,900,000	Rental Homes	SCAG
MacArthur Transit Village	City of Oakland Redevelopment Agency, BART, BRIDGE, and MacArthur Transit Community Partners	Infrastructure improvements by MacArthur BART station to support 90 affordable rentals with services and 90 parking spaces, plus 358 for-sale condos.	Oakland	\$17,000,000	Infrastructure	ABAG
MacArthur Park Metro Apartments Phase A	McCormack Baron and Salazar/MUDCO	90 affordable 2- and 3-bedroom apts. with 91 tenant parking spaces and 15,700 sq ft of retail with 42 parking spaces, above the Westlake/ MacArthur Park Metro Red Line station.	Los Angeles	\$9,293,755	Rental Homes and Infrastructure	SCAG
MacArthur Park Metro Apartments Phase B	McCormack Baron and Salazar/MUDCO	82 affordable rentals, 83 parking spaces, 17,310 sq ft of retail, above the Westlake/ MacArthur Park Metro Red Line station and tunnel box.	Los Angeles	\$7,705,055	Rental Homes	SCAG

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	TOD Award	Funding Type	COG
San Leandro Crossings	City of San Leandro and BRIDGE	100 affordable multifamily rentals, 200 for-sale units, 390 parking spaces, with approx. 5,000 sq ft of retail/commercial space, a block from the San Leandro BART station.	San Leandro	\$12,000,000	Infrastructure	ABAG
Trestle Glen	BRIDGE	4 stories, 119 family rentals, 125 parking spaces, with 56-space childcare facility, community room by the Colma BART station.	Colma	\$993,789	Rental Homes	ABAG
Lion Creek Crossing	City of Oakland, Related Co., and EBALDC	72 affordable rentals, 72 parking spaces, near Coliseum BART station, AC Transit bus transfer station, and Amtrak Capital Corridor stop.	Oakland	\$7,527,592	Rental Homes	ABAG
Coliseum BART Station Transit Village	City of Oakland, Related Co., and EBALDC	28 for-sale homes, 100 market-rate rentals, plus from above Lion Creek Crossing's 72 affordable rentals and 72 parking spaces, near Coliseum BART station.	Oakland	\$8,485,000	Rental Homes	ABAG
Bonnie Brae Apartments	American Communities	6 stories, 53 apartments, 53 parking spaces, community room with on-site classes, in Westlake community near Red Line Metro and 6th St. bus lines.	Los Angeles	\$4,633,933	Rental Homes	SCAG
Armstrong Place Senior Housing	BRIDGE	116 affordable senior apartments, 29 parking spaces, ground floor retail and community space, one block from the Carroll St. Station on MUNI's Metro T-THIRD line.	San Francisco	\$9,106,517	Rental Homes	ABAG

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	TOD Award	Funding Type	COG
Union City Intermodal Station District	Union City and Barry Swenson Builder	2 high-rise towers and 4 mid-rise buildings with 462 market-rate homes, 160 affordable rentals, 786 parking spaces, 33,617 sq ft of retail, 10,210 sq ft of business lofts, within 1/4 mile of Intermodal station to be served by BART, passenger rail and bus. (Eventual proposed total of 1,200 homes on 9 acres, with 55,500 sq ft retail.)	Union City	\$7,637,102	Infrastructure	ABAG
Ten Fifty B	City of San Diego and Affirmed Housing	23 stories, 226 affordable rentals, 3 manager units, 126 parking spaces, located two blocks from City College Trolley Station.	San Diego	\$4,002,240	Infrastructure	SANDAG
Commercial 22	City of San Diego and BRIDGE	127 rentals for families at 30-60% AMI; 70 rentals for seniors at 30-50% AMI; 38 live-work lofts; for-sale rowhouses; 333 parking spaces, with childcare, commercial/retail and office space.	San Diego	\$17,000,000	Rental Homes and Infrastructure	SANDAG
Chinatown Blossom Plaza	City of Los Angeles and Bond Companies	53 affordable rentals, 209 market-rate rentals, 372 parking spaces (175 for public use), with 20,000 sq ft cultural plaza, 40,000 sq ft of retail, by Chinatown Metro Rail Station.	Los Angeles	\$6,115,915	Rental Homes and Infrastructure	SCAG
The Railyards	City of Sacramento and Thomas Enterprise	388 market-rate and 69 affordable apartments, unspecified parking spaces, by Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility. Eventual planned total of 12,000 homes (1,800 affordable), plus retail/office, entertainment uses.	Sacramento	\$17,000,000	Infrastructure	SACOG

Appendix E

Round One: 46 Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program Awards (June 2008)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
SEASONS at Compton	LINC Housing	84 permanent supportive rentals: 42 for limited income seniors; 41 for adults with developmental disabilities or adults caring for a dependent adult or child with developmental disabilities; 76 parking spaces; on-site services in partnership with South Central L.A. Regional Center, LEED construction, 1/10 mile from Metro bus stop, 2 miles from Blue Line light rail station.	Compton	\$3,169,934	So Cal	QIP	Site acquisition, open space and road improvements, water connections, sewer, street lighting, impact fees
El Monte Transit Village District	City of El Monte/ El Monte CRATV, LLC	First phase of Rio Paseo Village: 550 homes with 223 affordable (168 senior rentals, 55 for-sale condos) of total 1,850 planned homes, plus retail, office, entertainment uses, adjacent to the El Monte Transit Station (dedicated busway connecting to downtown LA).	El Monte	\$26,543,000	So Cal	QIA	Compact, high capacity storm-water drainage, utility consolidation in accessible corridors, integrated walkways to enhance walkability and transit access.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Westside II	Cloudbreak Inglewood LLC	4 stories, 196 units of special needs housing for veterans with physical and mental disabilities, alcohol/drug issues, including 25% SRO units for low-income veterans. Support services by US Veterans Initiative. Adds 206 parking spaces. Joins Westside Residence Hall which already provides 315 rentals for veterans, 224 parking spaces.	Inglewood	\$7,500,000	So Cal	QIP	City-required parking to support previous 315 rentals.
Andalucia Heights	AMCAL Multi-Housing, Inc.	75 and 66 affordable rentals for large families, 91 affordable senior rentals, recreational rooms, on-site services, in Westlake area.	Los Angeles	\$4,327,000	So Cal	QIP	2 subterranean parking structures, sidewalk, street and alleyway improvements, utility undergrounding and connections, impact fees.
Boyle Hotel Apartments	East L.A. Community Corporation	Rehabilitation of 31 apts. In the historic Boyle Hotel, plus new 3-story building with 20 apts., 21 parking spaces, 4,100 sq ft of ground floor retail, across from the future MTA Gold Line stop at 1st St. and Boyle Ave.	Los Angeles	\$1,000,000	So Cal	QIP	Parking structure for new apartment building, fire hydrant, driveway, trees, Storm-water Mitigation Plan requirements, impact fees.
China Town Blossom Plaza	China Town Blossom Plaza, LLC	53 affordable rentals, 209 market-rate rentals, 372 parking spaces (175 for public use), 20,000 sq ft cultural plaza, 40,000 sq ft of retail, by Chinatown Metro Rail Station.	Los Angeles	\$10,114,080 Also received TOD award.	So Cal	QIP	Site preparation, curb, gutter, sidewalk, disposal of contaminated soils, residential parking structure, transit shelter, worker safety costs, security.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Figueroa Corridor	LA Community Redevelopment Agency/ Figueroa Corridor Partnership/ South Park Business and Community BID	QIP: YWCA/Job Corps 200 affordable rentals with job training services. QIA: Morrison Hotel (85 affordable rentals), Pierce Bros Mortuary (60 affordable and market-rate rentals), CFRC (65 affordable rentals), Figueroa South (500 or more market-rate homes), major retail and office space, hotels, dining, entertainment, health club, plaza, near two subway lines, DASH, Metro buses, eventual Expo line.	Los Angeles	\$30,000,000, including \$904,800 for parks.	So Cal	QIA	Figueroa, 11th St., MLK Jr. Blvd. and Washington Blvd. streetscape improvements, Venice Hope Recreation Center, Expo Park Sports Fields, Gilbert Lindsay Park, Freeway Cap Park.
Glassell Park	L.A. Community Design Center with LA Unified School District (LAUSD)	Joint development across from Glassell Park Elementary School. Four stories, 50 family rentals, community room, 114 parking spaces (55 resident, 59 for district use), on .75 acres. LAUSD Early Education Center with 26 parking spaces on another .6 acres. Applying for LEED certification.	Los Angeles	\$2,604,360	So Cal	QIP	114-space subterranean parking structure, off-site improvements.
Las Margaritas	East L.A. Community Corporation	42-unit scattered site project including 20 new affordable apartments, social services, subterranean garage with 21 spaces, within walking distance of future MTA Gold Line station at 1st and Soto. Other portion: 22 rehabilitated rentals.	Los Angeles	\$911,040	So Cal	QIP	Residential underground parking garage.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Rosewood Gardens	L.A. Housing Partnership Incorporated	54 affordable senior apartments, community room, on-site services, 27 underground parking spaces, LEED construction, in Wilshire Center-Koreatown area near transit.	Los Angeles	\$1,985,272	So Cal	QIP	Undergrounding utilities, street trees and improvements, bike racks, lighting, parking spaces.
The Grand	County of Los Angeles (JPA)/ Grand Avenue LA, LLC (affiliate of The Related Companies)	16-acre Civic Park as part of The Grand Phases I and II: mixed-use developments with market-rate condos, affordable apartments, retail, hotel. Eventual size for Phases 1–3: 2,060-2,660 units (20% affordable), 449,000–660,000 sq ft of retail/restaurant, 295-room hotel, 5,000+ parking spaces.	Los Angeles	\$27,170,809	So Cal	QIA	16-acre Civic Park.
105th and Normandie Seniors Project	National Community Renaissance of California (CORE)	62 senior apartments (including six special needs units) for at-risk homeless and chronically mentally ill seniors, with community room, social service office, 52 parking spaces, in West Athens-Westmont District.	Los Angeles	\$1,033,418	So Cal	QIP	Underground utilities, Normandie Street improvements, street lights, dedication of existing alley.
3rd and Woods Family	National CORE	60 affordable multifamily rentals in East L.A., 120 parking spaces, community center, ground floor commercial, near bus transit center, 1/4 mile from two planned Gold Line stations.	Los Angeles	\$2,695,000	So Cal	QIP	Residential parking structure hard and soft costs, curb and gutter, sidewalk and streetscape improvements.

Appendix E

Evaluation of First Round Awards Under CA's TOD Housing and IIG Programs

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Palmdale Transit Village	City of Palmdale, Community Development Associates (CDA)	156 affordable apts., 46 for-sale townhomes for low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers, near Palmdale Transit Center. Part of larger Transit Village project, with projected 278 homes.	Palmdale	\$9,950,400 including \$144,500 for parks.	So Cal	QIA	Streets, sidewalks, streetscape, lighting, water lines, sewers, drainage, electrical lines, parks/open space, parking, property acquisition.
Perris Station Apartments	Perris Housing Investors, LP, TELACU Homes	Two stories of residential over one of parking, 84 apartments, 72 parking spaces, recreation center, retail/commercial space, by bus stop, multimodal bus hub, future Metro Link Station, near other commercial/retail.	Perris	\$3,843,360	So Cal	QIP	Residential parking structure.
Gangi Development, Senior Housing Mixed-Use Project	City of San Fernando	4 stories, 100 affordable senior apartments, 294 parking spaces for residents and public (replacing 144 spaces in current lot), 10,000 sq ft ground floor commercial, in downtown commercial district.	San Fernando	\$3,560,000	So Cal	QIP	Upgrade of existing street infrastructure and utilities, bus shelter, crosswalks, 100 of the parking spaces.
Ocean Breeze Apartments	Simpson Housing Solutions LLC and LINC Housing Corp.	20 affordable apartments for 55+, community space, above one level of retail, 16 underground parking spaces, within 1/4 mile of bus stop, park and grocery store.	Santa Monica	\$997,120	So Cal	QIP	Site preparation, utilities, street improvements, tree mitigation, landscaping, parking structure.
Plaza Amistad	Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation	150 family apartments, including 64 farmworker apartments, with community building, adjacent child care center, 336 parking spaces, 1/4 mile from downtown core.	Santa Paula	\$4,106,000	So Cal	QIP	Water lines, sewer and storm drain systems, underground detention basin, open space, ped/bike system, underground electrical lines, parking structure.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Citronica	Lemon Grove Community Development Agency	Mixed-use downtown redevelopment project with 181 market-rate rentals, 57 affordable rentals, 1/2 mile from the Orange Grove Lemon Grove trolley stop.	Lemon Grove	\$4,800,000 including \$12,000 for parks	So Cal	QIA	Upgrade public utilities, reconstruct Lemon Grove freeway off-ramp, widen North Avenue.
Commercial and 22nd Street Mixed Use Project	COMM 22, LLC (BRIDGE EDC, Bronze Triangle CDC, MAAC Project)	127 family rentals for 30–60% AMI, 70 senior rental units for 30-50% AMI, 38 market-rate live-work lofts and 17 row-houses, 485 parking spaces, childcare, office and commercial/retail space.	San Diego	\$9,680,534 including \$117,500 for parks. Also received TOD award.	So Cal	QIA	Demolition, excavation, UST cleanup, water, sewer, utility undergrounding, street and sidewalk improvements, 85 parking spaces.
Mobile Haven Senior Apartments	National Community Renaissance of CA (CORE)	61 senior rentals, 52 parking spaces, community/recreation room.	Escondido	\$650,959	So Cal	QIP	Juniper St. widening; Juniper St. and Washington Ave. improvements, Waverly Pl. reconstruction, water main loop and extension.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Central Business District/Uptown	City of Oakland Redevelopment Agency	298 market-rate ownership homes and 73 affordable rentals, renovation of historic FOX theater, supporting infrastructure including streetscape improvements to link housing with 19th St. BART station and neighborhood services.	Oakland	\$9,903,000	Nor Cal	QIA	Latham Square and Telegraph Avenue streetscape improvements, 17th St. and Broadway pedestrian improvements, Fox Theater renovation.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
MacArthur Transit Village	City of Oakland Redevelopment Agency, BART and BRIDGE	Infrastructure improvements to support 304 for-sale condos developed by MacArthur Transit Community Partners, and 90 affordable rentals developed by BRIDGE Housing with tenant services, total 394 parking spaces, by MacArthur BART station.	Oakland	\$17,300,383, including \$946,345 for parks. Also received TOD award.	Nor Cal	QIA	Replacement parking structure, excavation, grading, streets, sidewalks, sewer, water, storm drain, utilities, benches, trees, landscaping, bike racks, administrative and contingency costs.
Saint Joseph's Senior Apartments and Affordable Home Ownership	BRIDGE Housing	Phase 2 (Phase I was 84 affordable senior apts.): Adaptive reuse of historic St. Joseph's Home for the Aged complex, with 74 affordable ownership homes, adaptive reuse of historic Laundry and Smokehouse Buildings. By AC Transit stops, 1/2 mile to Fruitvale BART station.	Oakland	\$3,189,280	Nor Cal	QIP	Water, sewer, utility improvements, residential parking structure, site preparation and demolition, sidewalk improvements, restoration of brick wall.
7555 Mission Street	Peninsula Habitat for Humanity	36 self-help affordable condos for families in 3 stories over 57-space parking structure, near Colma BART station.	Daly City	\$1,756,800	Nor Cal	QIP	Rebuilding 1st Ave. cul-de-sac, undergrounding utilities, podium parking structure.
6th and Oak Senior Homes	Affordable Housing Associates	8 stories, 80 rentals for 55+, community room, one floor of office space, 20 parking spaces, 2 blocks from Lake Merritt BART station.	Oakland	\$2,000,000	Nor Cal	QIP	Residential parking structure.

Appendix E

Evaluation of First Round Awards Under CA's TOD Housing and IIG Programs

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Tassafaronga Village	Oakland Housing Authority	Redevelop 87 units of severely distressed public housing; 157 new rentals: 77 townhomes; 60 apts.; 20 loft units in rehabilitated former pasta factory, plus 22 for-sale townhomes (by East Bay Habitat for Humanity); near major AC Transit stops, one mile from Coliseum BART station.	Oakland	\$6,119,522	Nor Cal	QIP	Reduce contamination; improve streets, pathways, sidewalks, pedestrian and bike access, utilities, exterior lighting and security systems, meet storm-water requirements.
Geary Boulevard Senior Living and Health Center	BRIDGE Housing and City and County of San Francisco	Geary Blvd. Senior Living and Health Center, with 150 affordable senior apartments and an Institute on Aging health center, 6 stories, 30 resident and 37 health center parking spaces; on transit routes.	San Francisco	\$3,244,650	Nor Cal	QIP	Geary Blvd. sidewalk, curb, gutter, paving, pedestrian improvements, utility connections and fees, waste water capacity fee, below-grade residential parking structure.
Belovida at Newbury Park	Core Affordable Housing	Infrastructure for 178 affordable rentals for 55+, 164 parking spaces, within 25-acre master planned development (Newbury Park), about 1/2 mile from planned Berryessa BART station, 2 miles northeast of central business district.	San Jose	\$3,123,330	Nor Cal	QIP	Demolish part of one building; new streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, landscaping; street lights, hydrants; utilities; sewer, storm.
Fourth Street Apartments	First Community Housing	7 stories, 100 affordable multifamily rentals (35 for residents with developmental disabilities, services through San Andreas Regional Center), community room, above parking (110 spaces), two blocks from light rail.	San Jose	\$1,513,561	Nor Cal	QIP	Parking structure (100 of 110 spaces), stabilization of 120-year-old sewer pipe.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Kings Crossing	Charities Housing Development Corporation and City of San Jose	4 stories, 94 affordable apts., community space, 155 parking spaces. First residential portion of 25-acre Newbury Park community, with planned 800–1,300 homes, near future BART extension to San Jose in former light industrial area.	San Jose	\$4,495,840	Nor Cal	QIP	Subterranean parking garage.
3rd Street Residential Development	Global Premier Development and Foundation for Affordable Housing	3 stories, 37 family apartments, 65 parking spaces, recreation/computer center, sustainable building methods, in Artist's District adjacent to redevelopment area.	San Jose	\$1,688,000	Nor Cal	QIP	37 of 65 parking spaces in subterranean parking garage for city-required 1.7 spaces/dwelling unit.
San Leandro Crossings	City of San Leandro, Westlake Development Partners, LLC and BRIDGE	Phase I: 86 affordable apartments, 102 parking spaces. Phase 2: 14 affordable apartments, 200 market-rate apartments, 290 parking spaces, 5,000 sq ft of retail space.	San Leandro	\$12,460,120 Also received TOD award.	Nor Cal	QIA	Site preparation, landscaping, utility undergrounding, street lights, street improvements, replacement BART parking structure (325 spaces), transit facility improvement, park impact fees.
Peninsula Station	Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition and City and RDA of San Mateo	68 affordable family apartments, on-site services, 8,000 sq ft of commercial and community space, underground garage for 123 cars, 43 bikes; within walking distance of Caltrain station, two bus stops on major routes; part of "Grand Boulevard" plan.	San Mateo	\$3,992,960	Nor Cal	QIP	Environmental remediation, water, sewer, street/road improvements, bike facilities, underground parking structure, utility improvements, drainage, site preparation, impact fees.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA: SACRAMENTO and OTHER AREAS

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Broadway Lofts	1901 Broadway MRES, LLC and KOAR Development Group, LLC	3–5 stories, 109 rentals, live/work spaces, 139 residential parking spaces, ground floor retail, 80 commercial spaces, across from Broadway Light Rail station. LEED, part of Safe City Program.	Sacramento	\$4,406,480	Nor Cal	QIP	Building demolition, upgrade sewer/storm drains; utilities; curb, gutter, sidewalk; fiber optic line w/ RT station; relocate bus terminal, pedestrian crossing; street repairs; bike lockers/racks; video surveillance cameras; street lights, landscaping; hydrants.
The Railyards	Thomas Enterprises	Mixed-Use TOD with 12,000 residences (1,800 affordable) on brownfield site near Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility served by Amtrak, RT light rail, and bus. 5 phases of rental housing on 5.8 acres: 456 market-rate, 96 affordable for large families, 101 affordable for seniors.	Sacramento	\$30,000,000 including \$848,000 for parks. Also received TOD award	Nor Cal	QIA	Extension of 5th Street, construction of Railyards Blvd. from 7th Street to Bercut with bicycle/pedestrian facilities, utility piping, lighting, landscaping; design, engineering, permitting costs.
Triangle Development Area	City of West Sacramento	Infrastructure to support Triangle Area east of UP rail line and catalyze private development. This Triangle portion to include 731 homes (198 affordable), office space, neighborhood park, riverfront promenade, roadway improvements to support a Downtown/ Riverfront Streetcar.	West Sacramento	\$23,081,360 including \$564,876 for parks.	Nor Cal	QIA	Reconstruction of Tower Bridge Gateway, 5th St. restriping, road reconstructions, bike/walkways, sewer, park improvements, rail removal, roadway improvements for anticipated Streetcar.

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Township 9 PUD	City of Sacramento	QIA: 65-acre, mixed-use master planned neighborhood, with 2,350 residences. QIP: 5 stories, 139 affordable apts., 800,000 sq ft of office space, 150,000 sq ft of ground floor retail, 20 acres of open space, near proposed Downtown-Natomas-Airport light rail line station.	Sacramento	\$19,100,000	Nor Cal	QIA	Richards Blvd. frontage, N. 7th St., Parkway, Riverfront Dr. and Riverfront Park improvements, residential parking structure, street frontage, transit improvements.
Del Norte Point Apartments	TELACU Homes	3 stories, 73 large-family affordable apartments, 110 parking spaces, clubhouse, within 1/4 mile of school, can use local Dial-a-Ride for transit.	Crescent City	\$2,035,650	Nor Cal	QIP	Utility extensions, water line installation, street improvements at main entrance.
Kings Beach Housing Now	Placer County Redevelopment Agency and Domus Development	Scattered site mixed-use project with 74 rentals, 8,000 sq ft of commercial space, 126 parking spaces, LEED construction.	Kings Beach	\$3,314,400	Nor Cal	QIP	Utility connections, street improvements, garage parking, landscaping, transit linkages, On-site Best Management Practices.
Salinas Gateway Apartments	First Community Housing	4 stories, 52 affordable rental townhomes/ flats (25 targeted to families/individuals with developmental disabilities, 26 to those with chronic illness needing daily assistance); 2,770 sq ft of retail space, 40 parking spaces. By downtown bus transit, Greyhound Station, Amtrak regional rail hub.	Salinas	\$1,500,000	Nor Cal	QIP	Structured parking.
Windsor Redwoods	Town of Windsor Redevelopment and Burbank Housing Development Corp.	65 affordable multifamily rentals (8 proposed for farmworker families, 5 for persons with developmental disabilities), 112 parking spaces, park, retail, with green design elements, near Sonoma County Transit stops.	Windsor	\$2,519,409	Nor Cal	QIP	Storm drain facilities, internal private street construction/streetscape, resurfacing of portion of Old Redwood Hwy.

CENTRAL VALLEY

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	IIG Award	Location	Type	Infrastructure Type
Fancher Creek Mixed-Use Residential Housing — Parking Structures	Francher Creek Properties, LLC	90-acre Fancher Creek Town Center: 558 homes and parking spaces, above lifestyle retail, movie theater, power center retail, office space, Civic Center with library, post office, police station, BRT station, daycare, plus lake, 8-mile walking trail. Part of larger 490-acre Fancher Creek project, with 1 million+ sq ft of business park, 1,000 single family homes, 120,000 sq ft of neighborhood retail.	Fresno	\$2,0961,940, including \$383,100 for parks	Central Valley	QIA	Widen Clovis Ave. to 6-lane divided road, utilities, above-ground water storage tank, water mains, sewer extension, storm drainage, lake for recharge/ drainage.
Magnolia Court	Affirmed Housing Group	51 affordable senior apartments plus 1 manager unit, near school, former skating rink, carwash, and commercial lot and buildings.	Manteca	\$1,788,800	Central Valley	QIP	Street improvements, offsite water and sanitary sewer upgrades.
Villa Siena Apartments	Housing Alternatives Inc	3 stories, 70 affordable apartments, 93 parking spaces, office space, courtyard, within 1/4 mile of bus stop/transit center.	Porterville	\$2,379,944	Central Valley	QIP	Demolition, prep work, grading, utilities, surface improvements: paving, curb/gutter, sidewalks, street lights, striping.
Gleason Park Apartments	Mercy Housing and City of Stockton	93 affordable apartments in 2- and 3-story bldgs, community center with Head Start, across street from elementary school and Gleason Park. Part of redevelopment effort with 16 new single-family homes, new mixed-use developments.	Stockton	\$1,482,285	Central Valley	QIP	American Street promenade to Park, reconstruction of Church and Stanislaus Streets, utility replacement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lights, bulbed curbs.

Appendix F

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program

Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

Second Round Criteria

For complete guidelines, see

http://hcd.ca.gov/fa/tod/SECOND_ROUND_TOD_HOUSING_PROGRAM_GUIDELINES_FINAL.pdf

Key Threshold Requirements

To be eligible, a housing development must:

- Consist of new construction or substantial rehabilitation or conversion of non-residential structure(s) to residences, with at least 50 rental and/or homeownership housing units.
- Be located within one of 28 specified urbanized areas.
- Be located within 1/4-mile of a Qualifying Transit Station (e.g., heavy or light rail station, bus rapid transit station, bus transfer station, bus hub).
- Restrict a minimum of 15% of the housing units to low- or very-low-income residents.
- Have a density of at least 25–60 units/acre (based on location).

To be eligible, an infrastructure project must provide substantial benefit to one such housing development, and include:

- Capital improvements required by a local government entity, transit agency, or special district as a condition to development of the housing development; and/or
- Capital improvements that clearly and substantially enhance public pedestrian or bike access between the housing development(s) and the nearest transit station.

Applicant Scoring

108(a) Extent project will increase public transit ridership, minimize auto trips		90
(1) Peak period frequency of 12 minutes or less, or specified on-time performance.		30
(2) Electronic user information at transit station.		4
(3) Current schedules and maps posted at transit station.		1
(4) Population density within 4-mile radius of transit station.		19–55
108(b) Location in area designated for infill or TOD		40
(1) Designated for infill development through a COG regional plan policy		20
(2) In an area designated for TOD in one/more specified plans or programs.		10
(3) Evidence of coordinated public/private investment.		10
108(c) Affordability		30
Percentage of rental or ownership homes to be developed that will be restricted to occupancy by various income groups.		.13–30

108(d) Transit-supportive land use		15
At least 10 transit-supportive amenities within 1/2 mile.		15
108(e) Extent project incorporates walkable corridor features		25
(1) No more than 25% of street blocks exceed 500 ft in length.		5
(2) Corridor fully served by continuous paved, American Disabilities Act-compliant sidewalks.		5
(3) Safe pedestrian crossing of any arterials between housing and transit station, and corridor adequately lighted for pedestrians after dark.		5
(4) Station with waiting facilities with lighting and overhead shelter.		5
(5) Transit station has bicycle access and provides secure bike storage or transit agency allows bikes on board.		5
108(f) Parking		30
(1) Housing development parking is charged separately and covers costs.		5
(2) Residents to receive at least one free/discounted transit pass for term of loan period.		5
(3) Shares parking between different uses.		5
(4) Dedicates parking spaces for car share vehicles.		5
(5) Meets specified maximum parking spaces for location and bedrooms.		10
108(g) Readiness		30
(1) Enforceable commitments for all construction period funding.		8
(2) Completion of draft or all environmental clearances.		4 or 7
(3) All necessary discretionary land use approvals granted excluding design review.		8
(4) Has one of the following: developer has fee title ownership or long-term leasehold; local design review approval obtained or not required; or all deferred payment grants and subsidies committed as allowed by Tax Credit Allocation Committee.		7
108(h) Leverage of permanent development funds over TOD funds > 100%		15
Permanent development funding as percent of requested program funds.	.75 points for each 10% increment over 100%	
108(i) Developer past performance		30
(1) Large/similar infill developments by applicant in past five years.		10 each
(2) Project is a joint development and developer has done a successful one in the last five years.		10
(3) Deductions for specified poor performance or non-performance.		-5 each (up to -50)
108(j) Community support through a documented, inclusive process		15

108(k) Project size		30
(1) 200 or more residential units		30
(2) 150–199 residential units		25
(3) 100–149 residential units		20
(4) 50–99 residential units		15

108(l) Adopted Economic Development Plan		10
(1) Jurisdiction with adopted General Plan economic development element.		10
(2) Jurisdiction with integrated economic development strategies; in state-approved Enterprise Zone; or in eligible New Market Tax Credit census tract.		5

108(m) Economic stimulus funding/local support		20
(1) Project with federal stimulus funds equaling at least 20% of HCD request.		20
(2) Project with federal stimulus funds equaling at least 15% of HCD request.		12
(3) Project with federal stimulus funds equaling at least 10% of HCD request.		8

Maximum Points Possible

350

Appendix G

Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program

Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

Second Round Criteria

For complete guidelines, see
http://hcd.ca.gov/fa/iig/Full_IIG_Guidelines_013009.pdf

Key Threshold Requirements

To be eligible, a capital improvement project (CIP) must be an integral part of, or necessary for, the development of a "Qualifying Infill Project" (QIP) or the housing designated in the application for a "Qualifying Infill Area" (QIA). The QIP or QIA must:

- Be located in an urbanized area.
- Be in a locality with an adopted Housing Element found by the state to be in substantial compliance with state Housing Element requirements.
- Include a minimum of 15% of the housing units as affordable (no more than 60% of area median income for rentals, or 120% of area median income for ownership), excluding required replacement housing units.
- Include average, minimum net densities above or equal to California's Housing Element default densities for accommodating lower-income households (10–30 units/acre, depending on location).
- Be in an area designed for mixed-use or residential development pursuant to one of four specified adopted plans.
- Meet one of three definitions of "infill." (See Appendix C for definitions.)

A QIA must be a contiguous, coherent area treated as a discrete planning area, without extensions or satellite areas included solely to meet program requirements. A QIA must include within its boundaries a QIP that does not contain more than 50% of the total housing units proposed for the QIA and that has received all land use entitlements or has a complete application pending before the appropriate jurisdiction.

A QIP must be a discrete development with all housing development components planned as one development. A QIP must also have a common, affiliated, or contractually related ownership and financing structure.

Applicant Scoring — Qualifying Infrastructure Area (QIA)

310(a) Readiness	90
(1) Adopted, certified, or draft program, master, or tiered Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or not less than 50% of QIA land area on sites that have been subject to Phase I Site Assessment within prior 1 year.	5–25
(2) All necessary discretionary land use approvals granted for not less than 1/2 or 1/3 of housing units proposed for development in QIA; QIA is subject to adopted general, specific, redevelopment area, community or similar area-specific plan, and housing is consistent with such plan; or all approvals granted for Community Improvement Project (CIP) within the QIA.	5–25
(3) Enforceable commitments for construction period funding for residential units and/or CIP; or letters of interest or intent to fund CIP	5–20
(4) Stimulus funding of at least 10–20% of requested grant amount; local funding commitment(s) for QIA and/or CIP of at least 15–25% of grant amount; at least 50% of homes on site(s) identified in Housing Element or Council/Board/Planning Director letter of support.	3–20

310(b) Affordability	60
Percentage of rental or ownership homes to be developed in the QIA that will be restricted to occupancy by various income groups.	2–60
310(c) Adjusted net density as percentage of required density	40
200% or more	40
175–199.9%	30
150–174.9%	20
125–149.9%	15
110–124.9%	10
Less than 110%	0
310(d) Access to transit	20
Percentage of residential units in QIA within 1/2-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop, relative to total residential units in QIA.	2 per each 10%
310(e) Proximity to amenities	20
Specified amenities (e.g., parks, employment centers, retail centers, public schools/colleges, social services, senior centers) within QIA or within 1/2 mile of QIA boundary.	2–4 each
310(f) Consistency with COG Regional Blueprint or Growth Plan	20
Maximum Points Possible	250

Applicant Scoring — Qualifying Infrastructure Project (QIP)

309(a) Readiness	90
(1) Completion of all necessary environmental clearances or mitigated negative declaration; public notice of draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), negative declaration, or environmental assessment; or Phase I/II Site Assessment.	5–25
(2) All necessary discretionary land use approvals; applications for approvals deemed complete; or consistent with local planning documents and zoning.	5–25
(3) 50–95% of construction and/or permanent period funding commitments for Community Improvement Project (CIP) and QIP, with specified exceptions.	5–20
(4) Stimulus funding of at least 10–20% of requested grant amount; local funding commitment(s) for QIA and/or CIP of at least 15–25% of grant amount; QIP on a site identified in the local Housing Element, or Council/Board/Planning Director letter of support.	3–20
309(b) Affordability	60
Percentage of rental or ownership homes to be developed that will be restricted to occupancy by various income groups.	2–60

309(c) Adjusted net density as percentage of required density	40
150% or more	40
140–149.9%	30
130–139.9%	20
120–129.9%	15
110–119.9%	10
Less than 110%	0

309(d) Access to transit	20
Within 1/2-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop with 6–12 departures as specified during peak AM and PM hours.	20
Within 1-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop with 6–12 departures as specified during peak AM and PM hours.	10
Within 1-mile walk of transit station or major transit stop in a rural area with at least 2 departures during both AM and PM peaks, or at least 4 departures during AM and PM peaks in a locality with population over 40,000 to 100,000.	5

309(e) Proximity to amenities	20
(1) Within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of public park (1/2 mile or 1 mile for rural projects).	6 or 4
(2) Within 1 or 2 miles of locally recognized employment center with minimum 50 full-time employees (2 or 4 miles for rural area projects).	7 or 4
(3) Within 1 or 2 miles of locally recognized retail center with minimum 50 full-time employees (2 or 4 miles for rural area projects).	7 or 4
(4) If 50% of QIP residences have 2 or more bedrooms, is within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of public school or community college (1/2 mile or 1 mile for rural projects).	7 or 4
(5) If project provides special needs, single-room occupancy (SRO), or supportive housing, is within 1/2 mile or 1 mile of social service facility that serves residents of QIP.	7 or 4
(6) If project is senior housing, is within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of senior center or senior service center (1/2 mile or 1 mile for rural projects).	7 or 4

309(f) Consistency with COG Regional Blueprint or Growth Plan	20
--	-----------

Maximum Points Possible

250

Appendix H

Housing California would like to thank our advisors for their expertise and input to this Round One evaluation:

TOD/IIG Advisory Committee

- Bob Allen, Urban Habitat
- Susan Baldwin, San Diego Association of Governments
- James Corless, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Jeff Hobson, TransForm
- Shelley Poticha, Reconnecting America/Center for Transit-Oriented Development
- Beth Steckler, Consultant, formerly with Livable Places, Southern California
- Sarah Truehaft, PolicyLink

Land Use and Finance Working Group

- Joan Burke, Loaves and Fishes
- Tom Collishaw, Self-Help Enterprises
- Cesar Covarrubias, Kennedy Commission
- Elissa Dennis, Community Economics
- Karen Flock, Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation
- Michael Lane, Self-Help Enterprises
- Felicity Lyon, California Coalition for Rural Housing
- Nevada Merriman, Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition
- Tim O'Connell, Century Housing
- Doris Payne-Camp, San Diego Housing Federation
- Ben Phillips, Mercy Housing
- Mike Rawson, California Affordable Housing Law Project
- Shamus Roller, Sacramento Housing Alliance
- Kalima Rose, PolicyLink
- Matt Schwartz, California Housing Partnership Corporation
- Tom Scott, San Diego Housing Federation
- Joshua Simon, Northern California Community Loan Fund
- Mona Tawatao, Legal Services of Northern California
- Paul Zimmerman, Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing