



WWW.HOUSINGCA.ORG

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

Authors: Sharon Sprowls, Nathan Cataline, Judson Brown (Housing California)

Editor: 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 issue \$2.85 billion in general obligation bonds to fund 13 different housing and development programs. Included among these were two new programs: the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program and the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program.

Housing California believes that state funding for housing programs like the TOD and IIG are critical for developing a variety of quality, affordable places to live for all Californians. The TOD and IIG are both forward-thinking programs, providing essential funding to support development and infrastructure projects that will create a range of homeownership and rental choices. The two programs also have the potential to support California Senate Bill 375 implementation, landmark legislation that connects transportation and land-use planning at the regional level, by supporting infrastructure and construction of a mix of housing choices near quality transportation options and amenities.

As a leading partner in the drafting and passage of Proposition 1C, Housing California decided to conduct an evaluation of both the TOD and IIG programs. The goal of this evaluation is to assess how well these programs met the goals of increasing the supply of homes affordable to lower-income Californians and promoting effective transit-oriented and infill development.

An interim report on the first round of program awards was issued in July 2009. This report completes the analysis of the program outcomes, following the second, and final, funding round of each program. Data for this report was collected through November 2010. It also includes recommendations for TOD program revisions if a new source of program funds becomes available in the future.

Housing California wishes to thank the Ford Foundation for funding this evaluation.

II. Program Background

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

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) administers the funds for both new programs. Building on legislative statutory requirements, HCD staff conducted an extensive input process with experts and stakeholders to develop detailed threshold and scoring criteria for the first funding round of each program. HCD issued Round 1 Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) in late 2007 and early 2008. Round 1 award recipients were announced in June 2008.

Because of the economic downturn and a desire to encourage more job creation in California, HCD consolidated planned Round 2 and Round 3 funding cycles into a single Round 2 for each of the programs. HCD drafted revised guidelines and provided opportunities for public input through workshops, meetings, and written comments before finalizing program guidelines for the Round 2 funds. NOFAs were issued in early 2009, with Round 2 award recipients announced in June 2009.

The following are general descriptions of the two programs:

(1) **The Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program** — The TOD program provides a total of \$271 million in grants and loans to local governments and developers. The purpose of the program is to both stimulate the production of housing near transit, including market rate and affordable units, as well as increase transit ridership. Funds may be used for housing development costs; infrastructure necessary to housing developments; capital improvements to enhance pedestrian or bicycle access from housing developments to the nearest transit station; and/or land acquisition by a redevelopment agency during the predevelopment period.

(2) **The Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program** — The IIG program provides \$730 million for infrastructure supporting urban infill housing development, including construction and/or improvement of streets and public transportation facilities, parks, water, and sewers. The IIG program had two application subcategories. One for individual developments, or “Qualified Infill Projects” (QIPs), the other for larger areas containing multiple housing developments, or “Qualified Infill Areas” (QIAs).

A summary of the TOD and IIG programs' Round 1 and Round 2 eligibility requirements and scoring system are included in Appendices A through E. In all, HCD made awards of nearly a billion dollars to 27 TOD and 93 infill infrastructure projects. Award descriptions may be found in Appendices F, G, H and I.

III. Evaluation Methodology

To conduct this evaluation, Housing California staff gathered detailed information from the grant applications, including the proposed projects' location, cost, target populations, numbers of homes and bedrooms, density, affordability, proximity to transit and amenities, and other features in order to analyze scoring for both programs.

Housing California organized two advisory committees of experts on transit-oriented and infill development from around the state, one after the first round of awards and one after the second round. TOD/IIG Advisory Committee members did not include participants who were actual or potential applicants for TOD or IIG funds. In addition, Housing California's Land Use and Finance Working Group, which includes nonprofit developers, also provided feedback on our findings. For a complete list of Advisory Committee and working group members, refer to Appendix M.

Both Advisory Committees discussed Round 1 and Round 2 program guidelines, award outcomes, and recommendations for program revisions. The Advisory Committee gave input on which aspects of the program to analyze, crafted potential alternate scoring systems to assess, and, after the Round 2, developed a set of recommendations for modifying the TOD program.

Finally, Housing California staff also met with HCD staff to review the draft final evaluation report.

The next two sections of the evaluation present data collected by Housing California staff from HCD. This data is meant to show the performance and outcomes of both the TOD and IIG programs. The final section of the report provides recommendations based on program data and discussions with the Advisory Committee and Land Use and Finance Working Group.

For a glossary of terms used in this report, refer to Appendix L.

IV. Award Outcomes: Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) funded two rounds of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) awards, granting a total of \$271 million to 27 total projects statewide. With 119 submitted applications, there is a clear interest in TOD projects across the state. Of the funded projects, six received the full award of \$17 million.

In Round 2 of the TOD Program, HCD provided \$19 million less in total funding and four fewer awards than Round 1. Round 2 also saw an increase in the number of partnerships between cities, nonprofits, and for-profits. The table below compares funding between Round 1 and Round 2, as well as totals from both rounds.

Table 1 - TOD Awards, Rounds 1 and 2			
	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
Amount awarded	\$145 million	\$126 million	\$271 million
Number of awards	16	11	27
Awarded full \$17 million	3	3	6
Partnerships			
For-profit/Nonprofit	7	5	12
For-profit	5	--	5
Nonprofit	4	3	7
City/For-profit	--	2	2
City/For-profit/Nonprofit	--	2	2
Total applicant pool and oversubscription	59 applications for \$548 million	60 applications for \$604 million	119 applications for \$1.1 billion

Purpose of the Program

Over both rounds, more awards went toward rental-home development than toward infrastructure to support housing developments. Of the awards, a majority of funds for housing went towards new construction projects, with only three awards going towards rehabilitation. The rehabilitation projects were:

- Downtown Los Angeles: A former single-room occupancy (SRO) hotel, developed into affordable and market-rate lofts.

- San Francisco: A mix of 174 affordable and market-rate studio apartments at the Golden Gate Avenue YMCA, located in the Tenderloin neighborhood.
- Los Angeles: Two old buildings converted into 123 affordable apartments in Los Angeles' Chinatown.

The table below provides more detail on the award purposes and project types.

Table 2 - TOD Awards by Purpose and Type			
	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
<u>Award Purpose</u>			
Rental-home development	8	6	14
Housing infrastructure	5	2	7
Rental homes & housing infrastructure	3	3	6
<u>Award Type</u>			
New construction	14	10	24
Rehabilitation/reuse	1	2	3

Geographic Distribution of Awards

TOD project awards were divided between Northern and Southern California, with 52% of funded projects in Northern California and 48% of funded projects in Southern California. In addition, Round 1 required that at least one project in each of the following council-of-government areas receive an award: Sacramento, San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San Diego. While all of the projects awarded met the eligibility threshold, if not for this requirement, some regions may have lost out. The table on the next page shows project location by region across the state.

Table 3 - TOD Awards by Region			
	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
<u>Northern CA</u>			
San Francisco Bay Area awards	7	3	10
Sacramento awards	1	2	3
Total	8	5	13
<u>Southern CA</u>			
Los Angeles region awards	6	4	10
San Diego awards	2	2	4
Total	8	7	14

TOD Project Details

TOD projects varied between residential-only developments and mixed-use developments that included uses such as: childcare facilities, community centers, and retail space to commercial and office space, hotel, and entertainment uses. Eight projects were solely residential, but were located in areas with existing or planned businesses, community centers, office space, or other uses.

Round 2 also showed greater variation in development's parking supply. For example, two projects provided no residential parking, while two other projects provided more parking than average.

The table below breaks down the transportation access, mix of uses, and parking outcomes from both rounds of the TOD program.

Table 4 - TOD Program Transit Access, Mix of Uses, Parking			
	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
<u>Mix of Uses</u>			
Mixed use	11	8	19
Residential only	5	3	8
<u>Parking</u>			
Zero	--	2	2
From .1 to .8 spaces/home	5	2	7
1 space/home	6	2	8
From 1.1-1.4 spaces/home	4	4	8
1.5 spaces/home	--	2	2

Transit-Supportive Land Uses

HCD's TOD program guidelines mandated that each project have at least 10 transit-supportive amenities and services nearby. Of the projects that received awards, nearby amenities included:

- Nearby qualifying transit station, at least one restaurant, one café, and one school (ranging from elementary school to private career college) = 22 projects
- At least one hair-care salon and one health club or sport or recreation facility (usually a park) = 21 projects
- A pharmacy = 19 projects
- At least one grocery store, one place of worship (ranging from small to large), and at least one medical/dental location (ranging from an individual dentist's office to a full hospital) = 18 projects
- At least one bank/credit union and one laundry or dry-cleaning facility = 17 projects
- At least one convenience store and a fire or police station = 16 projects
- A child care facility = 15 projects

Housing Characteristics

The TOD program helped fund an array of affordable and market-rate developments featuring both for-sale and rental homes. For example, there are two proposed mixed-income projects that include market-rate for-sale homes, while two other developments included for-sale homes targeted to low- and moderate-income homebuyers. Conversely, fifteen out of twenty-eight projects were completely affordable. The chart below details housing characteristics, including the number of ownership and rental developments and the percentage of affordable homes for both rounds of the program.

Table 5 - TOD Program Housing Characteristics			
	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
<u>Home characteristics</u>			
Rental only	10	8	18
Rental and ownership	6	3	9
<u>Affordable % of total homes</u>			
100% Affordable	8	7	15
42-78% Affordable	--	1	1
0-41% Affordable	6	3	9

Home Production and Affordability

The following chart outlines the number of homes built and home affordability levels between Round 1 and Round 2. With less funding available, Round 2 helped produce fewer total homes and affordable homes, fewer bedrooms in affordable homes, and smaller homes overall. It also provided less money for developments targeting low-income households. However, Round 2 did have a greater percentage of total homes that were affordable, and more total homes were targeted for households earning extremely low and low incomes.

Table 6 - TOD Program Total Home Production by Income Level

	Extremely Low Income (ELI) 30% AMI*	Very Low Income (VLI) 50% AMI*	Low Income 80% AMI*	Market-rate homes	Manager units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Percent affordable	Total ELI & VLI homes	Percent of total
Round 1	230	1,004	608	1,739	12	3,593	1,842	51%	1,234	34%
Round 2	345	1,126	193	886	15	2,565	1,664	65%	1,471	57%
Total	575	2,130	801	2,625	27	6,158	3,506	57%	2,705	44%

*Area Median Income

Table 7 - TOD Program Production by Bedroom and Density

	Total Bedrooms			Density	
	Total bedrooms	Total ELI/VLI bedrooms	ELI/VLI as % of total bedrooms	Average homes/acre	Average parcel size
Round 1	6,163	2,239	36%	155.92	2.61
Round 2	3,837	2,177	57%	144.46	2.52
Overall	10,000	4,416	44%	150	2.57

Gentrification Impacts

During the evaluation of the TOD program, Housing California's Advisory Committee noted that TOD developments can have significant gentrification impacts on affordable neighborhoods near transit. In an effort to further examine the link between TOD investment and gentrification, Housing California staff and advisory committee members considered current research to explore the risk of gentrification for some of the TOD developments. This process is discussed in further detail in the "Recommendations" section (Section VII) in this report.

Home Production with Alternative TOD Scoring Criteria

In Housing California's first-round evaluation of the TOD program, staff recommended doubling the number of points awarded for including affordable homes within a development from 30 to 60. To see the impacts of scoring changes, we ran two different scenarios to compare how doubling points awarded for affordability might have impacted housing production. In addition to the original scoring system, we ran two additional scenarios:

- Eliminating the allowed alternative of using the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee's (CTCAC) scoring system, and doubling the affordability points to a possible 60 points.
- Keeping the 30 point maximum points awarded for affordability while eliminating the CTCAC scoring option.

These scenarios provide an idea of how scoring system changes might have affected Round 2 outcomes. However, alternate scenarios could only be calculated using actual applications that were submitted. It is not possible to determine how scoring differences might have affected who chose to apply for Round 2 funds. Since developers often self-score prior to applying for state funding, it is difficult to say how many people were deterred from applying because of the scoring system.

As shown below, in all categories except homes for low-income households, the original Round 2 scoring yielded more homes than the other two scoring scenarios. Shaded cells indicate the highest number between the three scoring scenarios.

Conclusion

The Transit-Oriented Development program funded a wide array of project types. Round 2 applicants include more partnerships between public, private, and nonprofit entities and awards resulted in more funding going toward low- and very-low-income households. The next section describes the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) program and its outcomes.

Table 8 - Round 2 TOD Program Scoring System Comparison

Actual scoring system	Extremely Low Income (ELI) 30% AMI*	Very Low Income (VLI) 50% AMI*	Low Income 80% AMI*	Moderate Income 120% AMI*	Market-rate homes	Manager units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total ELI and VLI homes
Total homes	421	1,297	76	95	1,212	12	3,113	1,889	1,718
Percent of total homes	13.50%	41.70%	2.40%	3.10%	38.90%	0.40%		60.70%	55.20%
Scenario 1: 60 point max for affordability without TCAC scoring option	Extremely Low Income (ELI) 30% AMI*	Very Low Income (VLI) 50% AMI*	Low Income 80% AMI*	Moderate Income 120% AMI*	Market-rate homes	Manager units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total ELI and VLI homes
Total homes	403	1,169	148	55	407	12	2,194	1,775	1,572
Percent of total homes	18.40%	53.30%	6.70%	2.50%	18.60%	0.50%		80.90%	71.60%
Scenario 2: 30 point max for affordability without TCAC scoring option	Extremely Low Income (ELI) 30% AMI*	Very Low Income (VLI) 50% AMI*	Low Income 80% AMI*	Moderate Income 120% AMI*	Market-rate homes	Manager units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total ELI and VLI homes
Total homes	403	1,100	148	55	407	11	2,124	1,706	1,503
Percent of total homes	19.00%	51.80%	7.00%	2.60%	19.20%	0.50%		80.30%	70.80%

*Area Median Income

V. Award Outcomes: Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) funded two rounds of the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) program, granting a total of \$730 million in 93 awards out of 124 applications. These awards are intended to promote infill housing development by providing funds for developments in need of infrastructure improvements. The program defines infrastructure as money for parks, water and wastewater improvements, streets and roads, parking structures, and streetscape improvements. Infrastructure improvement funding is critical to making affordable developments financially feasible.

Round 2 awards have a wider disparity between funding for Qualified Infill Projects (QIPs), which were individual developments, and Qualified Infill Areas (QIAs) and Large Multiple Phased Projects (MPPs), which were larger areas containing multiple housing developments. The following chart shows the differences in awards between Round 1 and Round 2. Overall, more funding went towards QIAs and MPPs than toward QIPs.

Table 9 - IIG Awards, Round 1 and 2			
	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
Total number of awards	46	47	93
<u>Funding Split</u>			
Qualified Infill Areas (QIAs) & Large Multi-Phased Projects (MPPs)	13	17	30
Qualified Infill Projects (QIPs)	33	30	63

Nonprofits led as applicants in both rounds, but Round 2 saw more partnerships between for-profits and cities and/or nonprofits.

Table 10- Partnerships			
Lead Applicant	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
Nonprofit	17	14	31
For-profit	8	3	11
For-profit/Nonprofit	3	10	13
City or other public agency	6	5	11
City/Nonprofit	6	3	9
City/For-profit	5	11	16
City/For-profit/Nonprofit	1	1	2

Geographic Distribution of Awards

Over both rounds, IIG project awards were divided between Northern and Southern California. The next two tables provide more detail on the geographic location of projects throughout the state.

Table 11 - IIG Awards by Geography			
Area	Round 1 awards	Round 2 awards	Total both rounds
<u>QIAs/MPPs</u>			
Northern California awards	6	9	15
Southern California awards	6	7	13
Central Valley awards	1	1	2
<u>QIPs</u>			
Northern California awards	15	13	28
Southern California awards	15	14	29
Central Valley awards	3	3	6

Table 12 - IIG Awards by Region			
<u>Northern CA Awards</u>			
Area	Round 1	Round 2	Total
San Francisco Bay Area awards	14	18	32
Sacramento area awards	4	4	8
Other area awards	3	-	3
<u>Central Valley Awards</u>			
Bakersfield awards	-	1	1
Other area awards	4	4	8
<u>Southern CA Awards</u>			
Los Angeles region awards	18	17	35
San Diego awards	3	3	6

Housing Characteristics

The IIG program funds infrastructure for new housing and mixed-use developments. In both rounds, two-thirds of awards went towards rental-home infrastructure, while one-third supported a mix of rental and ownership or ownership-only projects. In Round 2 the only all-homeownership project was a self-help housing development, where future homeowners help build their own homes.

Of the QIPs, only three projects were not entirely affordable in Round 1, compared to six projects in Round 2. Unlike QIPs, a majority of the QIAs and MPPs were mixed-income developments. The table on the next page provides more details on the type of construction, ownership, and percentage of affordable homes.

Home Production and Affordability

Over both rounds of IIG funding, the program provided infrastructure support for more than 19,500 homes. Round 2 helped fund fewer market-rate and affordable-homeownership projects, as well as fewer affordable rentals than Round 1. This is likely explained by the fact that the average size of awarded QIA/MPP projects dropped by more than 100 homes. Conversely, the size of QIPs did not significantly change between Round 1 and Round 2.

Below is a summary of home production from IIG Rounds 1 and 2, shading indicates the highest number when comparing Round 1 to Round 2:

Table 13 - IIG Awards, Total Home Production									
Round 1	Number of awards	% of all IIG funds	Total homes	Total market-rate homes	Total affordable homes	Affordable homes as % of total homes	Total affordable rentals	Ownership homes affordable 80% AMI*	Ownership homes affordable 120% AMI*
QIAs/MPPs	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
Total	46		9,905	5,021	4,826	49%	4,663	63	100
Round 2	Number of awards	% of all IIG funds	Total homes	Total market-rate homes	Total affordable homes	Affordable homes as % of total homes	Total affordable rentals	Affordable ownership homes 80% AMI*	Affordable ownership homes 120% AMI*
QIAs/MPPs	17	73%	7,029	4,525	2,504	36%	2,252	99	153
QIPs	30	27%	2,610	510	2,100	80%	2,078	22	0
Total	47		9,639	5,035	4,604	48%	4,330	121	153
Total both rounds	Number of awards	% of all IIG funds	Total homes	Total market-rate homes	Total affordable homes	Affordable homes as % of total homes	Total affordable rentals	Affordable ownership homes 80% AMI*	Affordable ownership homes 120% AMI*
QIAs/MPPs	30	72%	14,021	9,249	4,762	34%	4,457	117	188
QIPs	63	28%	5,523	807	4,668	85%	4,536	67	65
Total	90		19,544	10,056	9,430	48%	8,993	184	253

*Area Median Income

Total Bedrooms

Round 2 will yield more bedrooms than Round 1, although it will lead to fewer homes built. Round 2 projects average 348 bedrooms per development, while Round 1 projects average 294 bedrooms. However, Round 1 will yield 667 more bedrooms than Round 2. This is likely because 56% of all bedrooms in Round 1 developments were affordable, compared with only 45% in Round 2. The following tables provide a more detailed look at bedroom production. The shaded cells indicate the higher number.

Table 14 - IIG Affordable and Market-Rate Bedroom Production			
Round 1	Total bedrooms	Total market-rate bedrooms	Total affordable bedrooms
QIAs/MPPs	8,908	5,564	3,344
% of total	66%	93%	44%
QIPs	4,618	392	4,226
% of total	34%	7%	56%
Total	13,526	5,956	7,570
Round 2	Total bedrooms	Total market-rate bedrooms	Total affordable bedrooms
QIAs/MPPs	11,400	7,642	3,758
% of total	74%	91%	54%
QIPs	3,913	768	3,145
% of total	26%	9%	46%
Total	15,313	8,410	6,903
Total both rounds	Total bedrooms	Total market-rate bedrooms	Total affordable bedrooms
QIAs/MPPs	20,308	13,206	7,102
% of total	70%	92%	49%
QIPs	8,531	1,160	7,371
% of total	30%	8%	51%
Total	28,839	14,366	14,473

Conclusion

Overall, the Infill Infrastructure Grant program gave out more awards to QIPs, but QIAs and MPPs received a majority of the funding. Also, the majority of projects that received awards were located in the San Francisco Bay Area and the Los Angeles region. Round 2 saw an increase in the number of partnerships between public, private, and nonprofit entities, as well as an increase in the number of mixed-income developments. Round 1 produced more affordable bedrooms, as well as more homes overall. The next section compares the outcomes from the TOD and IIG programs.

VI. Comparison of the Round 2 Transit-Oriented Development Program and Infill Infrastructure Grant Program Awards

Round 2 of the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) program's QIA/MPP grants will support more total homes at all income levels combined, as well as more homes for very-low-, low-, moderate and above-moderate income households. However, the QIP and Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) grants targeted a much higher percentage of funds to homes for extremely low- and very-low-income households.

The following table shows the proposed income targeting for Round 2:

Table 15 - IIG and TOD Production by Income									
	Extremely Low Income (ELI) 30% AMI	Very Low Income (VLI) 50% AMI	Low Income 80% AMI	Moderate Income 120% AMI	Market-rate homes	Manager units	Total homes	Total affordable homes	Total ELI and VLI
QIA/MPP Grants									
Total homes	480	1,413	458	153	4,516	9	7,029	2,504	1,893
Percent of total homes	6.80%	20.10%	6.50%	2.20%	64.20%	0.10%		35.60%	26.90%
QIP Grants									
Total homes	711	1,120	269	0	485	25	2,610	2,100	1,831
Percent of total homes	27.20%	42.90%	10.30%	0.00%	18.60%	1.00%		80.50%	70.20%
TOD Grants									
Total homes	345	1,126	193	0	886	15	2,565	1,664	1,471
Percent of total homes	13.50%	43.90%	7.50%	0.00%	34.50%	0.60%		64.90%	57.30%

*Area Median Income

Awards per Home

When averaged across the number of affordable homes, the grant awards per home differ considerably between QIAs, QIPs, and TOD projects:

Table 16 - IIG and TOD Awards by Home		
	Grant award per home overall*	Grant award averaged per affordable home
IIG Round 1		
QIAs	\$34,461	\$106,710
QIPs	\$34,002	\$38,570
IIG Round 2		
QIAs	\$38,754	\$107,516
QIPs	\$38,426	\$47,776
TOD Round 1		
	\$40,188	\$81,875
TOD Round 2		
	\$40,475	\$66,702

*The TOD program also made loan awards to affordable-only rental projects, which are included in the overall award column

Multiple Awards

The following table shows projects that received multiple grant awards in both the IIG and TOD programs

Table 17 - Projects Awarded Multiple Grants	
Award	Project name and location
Received both Round 2 IIG and TOD awards	15 th and Commercial (San Diego)
	The Railyards (Sacramento)
	5555 Hollywood (Hollywood)
	South Hayward BART Mixed Use (Hayward)
	Bldv 6200-North (Hollywood)
	Long Beach/Anaheim TOD (Long Beach)
Received Rounds 1 and 2 IIG awards	Township 9 (Sacramento)
Received Round 2 IIG award and Round 1 TOD award	Union City Station District (Union City)

The previous two sections examined the outcomes of the TOD and IIG programs. The next section builds off of this data to make recommendations for modifying the existing TOD program.

VII. Recommendations for Modifications to the Transit-Oriented Development Program

The Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) program will lead to the production of 1,664 affordable homes and 2,565 total homes across the state of California. This success and the growing interest in transit-oriented development around the state and across the nation led us to develop a series of recommendations to guide future modifications to HCD's TOD program. In some areas, our Advisory Committee made recommendations for specific changes to the eligibility and scoring criteria; in others they suggested that HCD and stakeholders examine evolving TOD-related research to develop new program criteria.

The following is a summary of our Advisory Committee's discussions and our recommendations, with the recommended changes in bold. The first three categories are general recommendations, and the remaining 12 recommendations are specific to sections of the TOD application.

1. Catalyst Projects

For the previous two rounds of funding, there has been a distinction between project types that fall into two categories: awards made to projects in areas that already feature TOD, and targeted investment for projects that can be transformational to the project area. Because there is such a high need in California to build new affordable homes and preserve existing affordable homes in developed areas near quality transit, our Advisory Committee recommends adding the following goal to the statutory requirements:

We recommend that the program fund projects that will serve as models of, or catalysts for, pedestrian-friendly, transit-supportive developments that preserve or add permanent affordable homes to amenity-rich areas near high-quality transit that provides good connectivity to education and jobs.

2. Gentrification/Displacement

According to PolicyLink's *Equitable Development Tool Kit*, land within a five to ten minute walk of a transit station sells for 20-25% more than land outside of that walking distance. Such increased land value places a burden on developers of affordable homes and can lead to displacement around transit stations.

In addition to a high potential for gentrification, a 2009 study by AARP, *Reconnecting America and the National Housing Trust* found that a large percentage of HUD-assisted rentals in the Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Area regions are located near quality transit, but a majority of these homes have expiring HUD contracts. This could severely impact the supply of affordable homes near transit in both regions.

The first two rounds of HCD's program guidelines have attempted to measure applications' potential to displace residents. The guidelines specify that "if an application involved the demolition or rehabilitation of existing units affordable to lower income households, the Housing Development must include units with equal or greater affordability, equal to or greater than the number of the existing affordable units, except in cases where the rehabilitated units provide amenities such as bathrooms and kitchens not present in existing units in which case, the reduction may not result in more than 25% fewer units upon project completion."

The current application process assesses the history of a project to see how it has impacted current and previous tenants. However, despite this review, a first-round TOD loan was awarded for the rehabilitation of a single-resident occupancy (SRO) hotel, whose low-income tenants had recently been cleared out by the previous building owner. The application process should further screen applicants to ensure that this type of displacement does not occur.

Based on our analysis, we feel that it is important to discuss and potentially address how state investment should be approached for projects that might reduce the net housing stock or encourage gentrification.

Karen Chapple, Associate Professor of City and Regional Planning at UC Berkeley and Faculty Director of the Center for Community Innovation, has undertaken research on gentrification and authored *Mapping Susceptibility to Gentrification: An Early Warning Toolkit*. Based on this research, Professor Chapple concluded that census tracts that have gentrified meet four criteria. They:

- (1) are in the central city;
- (2) were below 80% of area median income in the earlier of the last two 10-year censuses;
- (3) had increases in educational attainment beyond the regional average between the last two 10-year censuses; and
- (4) had increases in housing appreciation above the regional average between the last two censuses.

Chapple and her assistants drew on the toolkit to assess previous gentrification and gentrification risk for areas in which projects receiving TOD awards were located. Of 19 measures used in the toolkit to evaluate gentrification risk, Chapple selected five measures easily obtainable from the U.S. Census and/or American Community Survey for census tracts. These were:

- (1) The percent of workers using transit is greater than the regional average.
- (2) The percentage of non-family households (e.g., occupants of single-room occupancies (SROs); transitional housing; or households composed of one or more unrelated individuals, such as seniors, singles, or housemates) is greater than the regional average.
- (3) The percentage of the building stock (rental or ownership) containing three or more units is greater than the regional average.
- (4) The percentage of renter households is greater than the regional average.
- (5) The percentage of households paying more than 30% of their income for rent is greater than the regional average.

For each measure found to be greater than the regional average, Chapple assigned one point. Census tracts with a score of three or more points were considered at risk of gentrification. Based on these measures, Chapple found that five of the awarded projects were in census tracts that had already gentrified, and 22 were in tracts at risk (or further risk) of gentrification. See Appendix J for this analysis. Chapple points out that amenity variables are also key in causing gentrification, but these variables may not be as easy to calculate or document as the five criteria above, and would require further consideration.

In addition to Chapple's work, Sarah Truehaft of PolicyLink composed a list of strategies that may help mitigate gentrification and displacement effects of TOD:

- Affordability of all or a majority of the homes in a TOD project.
- An adopted housing affordability preservation plan (now beginning to be developed for areas at risk).
- An operating land-banking program for affordable homes near a quality transit station or corridor.
- An adopted mixed-income zoning policy for the area in which the project is located, requiring that a percentage of all new rental or ownership homes built be affordable.
- An adopted community-benefits agreement between community organizations, public agencies, and the private developer that includes anti-displacement, affordability, local hiring, job training, or other elements to stabilize area residents and small businesses.
- Adopted local hiring/first-source hiring policies that set aside a portion of jobs generated by the development to local residents.
- Mitigation funds committed for small business disruption during the project construction period.
- Strategies in place to stabilize and attract small, neighborhood-serving businesses vulnerable to displacement (e.g., lease protections, small business assistance/commercial corridor program, zoning incentives).
- A local housing trust fund with local funds dedicated to the project area.
- Documented funds committed to groups that work with tenants facing displacement.

A point “offset” system was discussed in which a project applicant would receive negative points for a project located in an area at risk of gentrification, potentially calculated using Chapple’s aforementioned five measures, but earn offsetting points for mitigation strategies in place, including a high percentage of home affordability in the TOD housing project. Our Advisory Committee was not certain how workable such a formula would be. Some affordable homebuilders stressed that mixed-income projects in their area are usually most feasible in central, high-rent locations, i.e., those likely at risk of gentrification. Advisors were, therefore, concerned that a scoring system for gentrification risk could disadvantage projects in Southern California.

Because of these concerns, there was continuing interest in developing program provisions to address the impacts on home affordability and displacement that could result from state investment in TOD projects in areas at risk of gentrification that do not disadvantage any particular region.

We recommended that HCD continue to explore gentrification and equity impacts to ensure any new state TOD funds promote and maintain home affordability and availability near quality transit for households with low incomes. This focus is especially important in light of California Senate Bill 375 implementation, which could impact land and home prices.

In addition, we recommend the next round of funding incorporate the following goals for any future state TOD housing program:

- Increase affordability near quality transit in higher-income neighborhoods.
- Increase and maintain affordability and stabilize current residents living near quality transit in areas at risk of gentrification.
- Invest to improve high-poverty neighborhoods near transit.
- Ensure that the program is competitive and shared geographically across the state.

We also suggest that HCD ask if proposed acquisition/rehabilitation projects were ever HUD or affordable-home projects. Additionally, we recommend that HCD strengthen its existing protections to prevent project sponsors from switching extremely low- or very-low-income homes for low-income and moderate homes after the application has been approved for an award.

Finally, we strongly recommend that projects supported with state funds do not ultimately reduce the net housing stock of affordable homes, and that state funds encourage acquisition/rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable rentals near quality transit, many of which have HUD contracts expiring in the next five years.

3. Environmental Justice

Applicants were required to include an Environmental Impact Statement, but not to highlight any of the findings. **We recommended the program strengthen its existing requirements for applicants to identify 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.**

4. Section 103 Eligible Locations

Eligible projects had to be in one of the following urbanized areas, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. According to HCD, these were areas defined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as having significant congestion.

Antioch	San Diego	Manteca	Seaside-Monterey-Marina
Concord	San Francisco-Oakland	Mission Viejo	Simi Valley
Fairfield	San Jose	Modesto	Stockton
Fresno	Santa Barbara	Oxnard	Temecula-Murrieta
Gilroy-Morgan Hill	Santa Clarita	Petaluma	Thousand Oaks
Livermore	Santa Cruz	Riverside-San Bernardino	Tracy
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana	Santa Rosa	Sacramento	Vallejo

The Advisory Committee pointed out that some of the areas included do not have major transit lines, while other communities not included may be slated for high-speed rail. **We suggest that HCD review the eligibility criteria to determine the most effective definition for viable TOD locations.**

5. Section 108(a)(1) Transit Frequency

Round 2 awarded up to 30 points for “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.”

Twelve-minute headways or on-time performance may not be the most accurate measure of transit quality. Many transportation agencies now use 15-minute headways as a quality measure. In areas with quality transit, the number of options available is more important than any individual headway.

The point system also seemed somewhat inconsistent 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.

Since siting projects near high-quality transit central to the TOD program, we recommend that the measures of transit be:

- (1) The level of service or availability of all public transit options serving the housing development (within ½-mile for rail and ¼-mile for bus). This measure would include the service and frequency of heavy rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, bus, and ferry. This could build on the work of Caltrans, consultants such as Fehr and Peers, and other researchers to develop transit level of service or quality measures. This could also expand program competitiveness to areas with frequent high-capacity bus rapid transit or bus transit.
- (2) The connectivity of the available transit to education and employment within a 30-minute travel time (or perhaps 45 minutes in the case of suburban locations). The measure for quality transit should be defined as the ability to reach jobs or major destinations within a reasonable amount of transit time. Transit connectivity could be calculated with Transportation Demand Management (TDM) data, possibly with the assistance of the local council of governments.

We recommended that HCD work with experts to develop a standard methodology for project applicants to use to calculate these two measures.

6. Section 108(a)(4) Transit Mode and Population Density

Section 108(a)(4) provided up to 55 points based on the existing population density within four miles of different types of transit. Appendix K shows the distribution of awarded projects by mode type and point score.

HCD based this sliding scale on a 2007 study led by Professor Robert Cervero of UC Berkeley, as well as research conducted with Caltrans Division of Mass Transit, and a panel of other academic experts and practitioners. The study provided a literature summary of TOD and showed the usage of different types of transit systems.

Advisors noted that light rail and bus rapid transit received the same, although the research is still evolving on usage differences; use may vary in different locations. According to Jerry Walters of Fehr and Peers, Caltrain has higher ridership than other more-suburban commuter lines in the state, due to a number of factors. However, in the TOD program guidelines it was scored the same as other commuter rail systems. Additionally, express bus service, which sometimes offers only morning and evening peak service, was scored better than some more-frequent commuter-rail services.

Given that research in this area is still evolving, we recommended that HCD again work with technical experts and researchers in order to update this measure based on the latest findings on usage of different transit modes in relationship to surrounding housing and population density. We also suggest this scoring measure be incorporated into the transit quality and connectivity measures discussed above. Lastly, we suggest that if a population radius is used in any new measure, its calculation be modified for coastal areas where there is no population within certain directions.

7. Section 108(b)(1) and (b)(2) Location in an Area Designated for Infill or Transit-oriented Development

Under HCD's first two rounds of program guidelines, applicants received up to 30 points if the proposed housing development was located in:

- (1) An area designated for infill development through a regional plan policy adopted by the local council of governments – 20 points.
- (2) An area designated for transit-oriented development in the applicable local general plan, specific plan, zoning ordinance, community plan, redevelopment plan, or transit village plan, or in an area regulated by, or included in land use policies, regional blueprint plans, other regional plans, development regulations or programs which promote transit-supportive residential and nonresidential uses within the Project area – 10 points.

Certain councils of governments (COGs) in the state have designated Transit Priority Areas or Smart Growth Incentive areas. However, since not all have done so, our Advisory Committee was not certain that project applicants in areas with certain regional infill policies should receive significantly more points than those in areas with supportive local plans or zoning ordinances. Our advisors generally felt that projects should be rewarded if the regional COG, the local government, or both, had a plan for infill or transit-oriented development that included the proposed TOD housing site. **Thus, to reward both regional and local planning efforts, reflect SB 375's new requirement for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy, and reduce double-dipping on regional planning points, we recommend revising this section as follows:**

The following point scores will be awarded to applications whose projects are located in:

- (1) **An area designated for infill or transit-oriented development in a regional plan adopted by the local council of governments, including a regional blueprint plan or Sustainable Communities Strategy – 10 points.**
- (2) **An area designated for infill or transit-oriented development in the applicable local general plan, a local specific plan, zoning ordinance, community plan, redevelopment plan, or transit village plan – 10 points.**

8. Section 108(b)(3) Location in an Area Where There Is Coordinated Public and Private Investment

The first two rounds of TOD scoring gave 10 points to applications “where there is coordinated public and private investment in amounts sufficient to transform the area into a transit-oriented community, as evidenced by both of the following occurring within a half-mile radius of the Qualifying Transit Station:

- (A) Expenditures or commitments of public funds during the ten years preceding the application due date on transit-oriented infrastructure or housing in the amount of at least \$5 million; and
- (B) The construction during the ten years preceding the application due date of privately owned transit-supportive uses with a gross floor area of at least 50,000 square feet (including developments under construction).”

Advisory Committee members suggested that \$5 million spent on housing development and 50,000 square feet of retail might not be indicative of significant transformation of an area into a transit-oriented community. Instead, **we recommended that HCD develop a specific measure by which project applicants could show the jurisdiction had a long-term commitment to layering and leveraging public and private investments to improve the area or neighborhood around the qualifying transit station or transit corridor.**

9. Section 108(d) Transit-Supportive Land Use

Section 108(d) required applicants to identify and list in their application any of 25 specified “transit-supportive amenities and services” within a ½-mile of the Qualifying Transit Station. Ten distinct amenities and services received 15 points.

The Advisory Committee first recommended that this measure be redefined to capture the area within ½-mile of the housing development, since it is the distance from where people live that determines whether they will walk to school, retail, recreation, entertainment, services, and other uses.

The Advisory Committee also sought to identify measures that would more-fully capture the defining characteristics of areas best suited for TOD. Different amenities have different values in promoting transit use and local walking trips. This measure should therefore assess whether or not the project area has a land-use mix and amenities that would specifically support transit and pedestrian trips, and reduce vehicle trips, rather than using a simple amenities checklist.

Research and tools are evolving in this area. Such new research could provide more accurate measures of whether an area has a TOD-supportive land-use mix, design, and walkability than were available when the program first began. For example:

- Ongoing research and trip generation models may help to better pinpoint activity centers and amenities that are the best predictors of walking trips.
- A measure of retail jobs per household within ¼- to ½-mile of residences could be used as an amenity measure.
- In March 2007, Fehr and Peers developed several potentially useful criteria for AC Transit (in the East San Francisco Bay Area): an area density measure to assess if surrounding densities will support transit service, and a land-use mix tabulation to determine the extent of transit-compatible land uses near the project. They have since been working on a mixed-use development model.

- Walk Score (www.walkscore.com) is also evolving, and might in future be a more effective and simple way for project applicants to measure the walkability of the area in which they plan to develop.

Research and modeling is advancing on many of the elements that predict the success of TOD. **We therefore recommended that HCD again consult with leading experts in the field at the point that program modifications are being considered to utilize the latest tools available to refine this scoring area. This would complement the measures in 108(e) that address the walkability of the path of travel between the housing development and the transit station. This effort could also take into account new data sources and/or assistance available to project applicants.**

10. Section 108(e) The Extent to Which the Project Incorporates Walkable Corridor Features

Section 108(e) awarded points based on the extent to which the application demonstrates that specific features exist, or will exist upon project completion, in the primary walkable corridor between the housing development and the qualifying transit station. Five points were awarded for each of the following features:

- (1) No more than 25% of the street blocks in the corridor exceed 500 feet in length.
- (2) The corridor is fully served by continuously paved, American Disabilities Act-compliant sidewalks with a minimum width of 4 feet.
- (3) The corridor allows for safe pedestrian crossing of any arterials between the Housing Development and the Transit Station and the corridor is adequately lighted to accommodate pedestrian use after dark.
- (4) The Transit Station contains transit waiting facilities that are lighted and provide overhead shelter from outdoor elements.
- (5) The Qualifying Transit Station has bicycle access and provides secure bicycle storage facilities, or the transit service allows bicycle conveyance on-board.

In the scoring system developed for AC Transit mentioned above, Fehr and Peers included two additional measures concerning walkability of the route to the transit station:

- Building setback and parking location, to reflect any setback and parking lot in front of the building that could create a barrier for pedestrians wishing to access transit services from the building.
- Whether building entrances provide entry from the sidewalk.

We recommended that HCD consider adding Fehr and Peers two additional measures to 108(e) as walkable corridor measures between the housing development and public transit.

Also, we recommend that walkability measures include the walkability of the neighborhood beyond the trip to the qualifying transit station, to include walking access to other transit services, including bus stops, or nearby amenities.

11. Section 108(f)(2) Transit Passes

Section 108(f)(2) provided five points to applicants who provide residents with free transit passes or discounted passes priced at no more than half of the retail cost. The language read, "At least one transit pass shall be made available to each Restricted Unit for the term of the Program loan." To implement this provision, HCD contracts require awardees to provide each household in an affordable unit a minimum of one, half-priced transit pass.

The five points awarded in this section can make the difference between receiving an award or not. One discounted transit pass per affordable household seemed minimal to our Advisory Committee for such a scoring advantage. HCD also did not require developers to provide transit passes to market-rate owners or renters, which seemed inequitable. Some of our advisors noted that long-term discount pass programs encourage transit use and enable low-income households to travel more frequently. However, some affordable homebuilders questioned whether they would be able to find the subsidy needed to cover a more-extensive transit-pass program, when it is already difficult for homebuilders to obtain all of the necessary financing and subsidies for affordable TODs to pencil out. For these reasons, **we recommended deleting this scoring criteria.**

12. Section 108(f)(3) and (f)(5) Shared Parking and Maximum Parking Spaces

Section 108(f)(3) awarded five 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." While one residential-only project received an award, points for residential-only projects were more difficult to claim, as there were no on-site uses with which to share parking. Some advisers questioned whether HCD should advantage mixed-use over residential projects, or whether residential-only projects should be able to earn back these points in some fashion. We recommend changing the scoring to give these points to applications in which shared parking is not an option.

At the same time, Section 108(f)(5) specified that 10 points would be assigned to project applications that provide for no more than the following maximum parking spaces, excluding park-and-ride and transit station replacement parking.

Project location designation	Bedrooms per home	Maximum resident and guest parking spaces per home
Large city downtown	0-1	1
	2+	1.5
Urban center	0-1	1.25
	2+	1.75
All other areas	0-1	1.5
	2+	2

Parking supply has a significant impact on whether residents utilize transit or not. Advisors discussed the possibility of a sliding point scale for parking supply, since some projects contained no parking at all, while others offered the maximum number of spaces. However, some noted that local jurisdictions, not applicants, control parking standards for development projects. For AC Transit in the East San Francisco Bay Area, Fehr and Peers developed a different parking-supply measure, providing points based on the extent to which the project's supply of parking is below, equal to, or greater than expected demand, based on rates published by the Urban Land Institute in their work on shared parking.

We recommended that HCD follow up with experts to determine the parking measure(s) that would best encourage a more-limited parking supply among TOD applicants to encourage residents' transit usage and the efficient use of land for parking, while reflecting locational differences.

13. Section 108(k) Project Size

In Round 2, Section 108(k) awarded

- 15 points to housing developments with 50–99 homes.
- 20 points to those with 100–149 homes.
- 25 points to developments with 150–199 homes.
- 30 points to those with 200 or more homes.

Our Advisory Committee noted that projects along certain transit lines might not compete well because available parcels are too small for 50 apartments or condos. The Expo Line in Los Angeles is one example. **We recommended that HCD add points for projects under 50 homes on small parcels that meet other TOD criteria.**

The program criteria also do not address differences in residential densities, which ranged from 32 homes per acre to 707 homes per acre. Projects also offered significant variations in the number of bedrooms per home, from studios to four bedrooms.

Advisory Committee members noted the benefit of more people living near quality transit and of efficient use of available parcels. **We therefore recommended adding scoring criteria and a point system to the TOD program to more fully capture residential density.** This could also offset project-size point losses for small but very-dense projects.

Advisors suggested devising the point scale based on the total number of bedrooms provided by the project divided by the acreage of the project, with more points provided to applicants with a higher number of bedrooms per acre. Such a point system should be designed — and likely tested with sample projects — to insure it takes into account the differences in the density and type of construction generally allowed by different jurisdictions.

14. Section 108(l) Economic Development Plan

Section 108(l) was added in Round 2 to read:

- (1) 10 points shall be awarded to applications for Projects located in jurisdictions that have adopted a general plan economic development element.

- (2) 5 points shall be awarded to applications for Projects located in jurisdictions that have integrated economic development strategies, are in a state-approved Enterprise Zone, or are in an eligible New Market Tax Credit census tract.

Our Advisory Committee noted that an economic development element may have little impact on where jobs are going, and could have little or nothing to do with transit service. Therefore, we recommend the transit connectivity measure to jobs and education, discussed above in section 108(a)(1) as a stronger way of assessing the employment linkage of the TOD project, and therefore recommended deleting 108(I) as a scoring measure.

15. Section 108(m) Economic Stimulus Funding

This section awarded points for obtaining a commitment or commitments of state or locally administered funds authorized under the 2009 federal economic stimulus package. **We recommend deleting this section because it is unclear when and if there will be more federal stimulus funding.**

VIII. Conclusion

Overall, both the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program and Transit-Oriented Development Program increased the supply of homes affordable to low-income Californians. Housing California commends the California Department of Housing and Community Development for its extraordinary work implementing these two new programs and looks forward to working closely on shaping future rounds of funding.

Round 1 Criteria
Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program
Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

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 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 ½ mile	15	

108(e) Extent project incorporates walkable corridor features		25
(1) No more than 25% of street blocks exceed 500' in length	5	
(2) Corridor fully served by continuous paved, ADA-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 TCAC.	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) 100-199 residential units	15	

Maximum Points Possible

350

Round 2 Criteria
Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program
Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

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 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.	1 0	
(3) Evidence of coordinated public/private investment.	1 0	
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 ½ mile.	15	

108(e) Extent project incorporates walkable corridor features		25
(1) No more than 25% of street blocks exceed 500' in length.	5	
(2) Corridor fully served by continuous paved, ADA-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) Dedicating 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 TCAC.	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 to 199 residential units	25	
(3) 100-149 residential units	20	
(4) 50 to 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

Round 1 Criteria
Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program
Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

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 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 ½ 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 ½ 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 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 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	
below 110%	0	
308(d) Access to Transit		20
(1) within ½ mile walk of transit station or major transit stop	20	
(2) within 1 mile walk of transit station or major transit stop	10	
(e) Proximity to specified amenities		20
(1) Within ¼ or ½ mile of public park (½ 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 ¼- or ½-mile of public school/community college (½-or 1-mile for rural areas).	7 or 4	
(5) If project provides special needs, SRO or supportive housing, is within ½- or 1-mile of social service facility that serves residents of QIP.	7 or 4	
(6) If project is senior housing, is within ¼ or ½ mile of senior center or senior service facility (½ mile or 1 mile for rural projects)	7 or 4	
(f) Consistency with COG Regional Blueprint or Growth Plan		10

Maximum Points Possible

130

Round 2 Criteria
Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program
Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

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 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 ½ 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 ½ 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 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 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 site identified in 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 ½ 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
(A) within ¼ or ½ mile of public park (½ mile or 1 mile for rural projects)	6 or 4	
(B) 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	
(C) 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	
(D) if 50% of QIP residences have 2 or more bedrooms, is within ¼ or ½ mile of public school or community college (½ mile or 1 mile for rural projects)	7 or 4	
(E) if project provides special needs, SRO or supportive housing, is within ½ mile or 1 mile of social service facility that serves residents of QIP	7 or 4	
(F) if project is senior housing, is within ¼ or ½ mile of senior center or senior service center (½ 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

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.

Round 1: 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
Trestle Glen *Application Withdrawn	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
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
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

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	TOD Award	Funding Type	COG
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
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

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Project Summary	City	TOD Award	Funding Type	COG
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

Round 2: 16 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Program Awards (June 2009)

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Brief Project Description	City	Qualifying Transit Mode/ Station	Total Award	Funding Type
Golden Gate Avenue (Central YMCA)	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp.	9 stories, 174 rehabilitated studio rentals, 0 parking spaces, at Golden Gate Avenue YMCA. Targeted to formerly homeless households, including those with HIV/AIDs, at 50% of AMI or less. In the Tenderloin District near retail, services, bus/light rail/ BART. Includes supportive services, child care and wellness centers, and neighborhood retail.	San Francisco	Heavy Rail: Civic Center BART	\$17,000,000	Rental Housing
1000 Fourth Street Family Housing	Mercy Housing California, Mission Bay Development Corp & Mayor's Office of Housing, City and County of San Francisco	150 rentals targeted to families at 15%-50% of AMI, 58 parking spaces, 9000 sf of retail as part of planned 4th St. retail corridor, less than 1/4 mile from light rail station. Part of SF's Mission Bay South planned for 6,000 homes (28% affordable), 6 million sf of office, commercial, technology uses, UCSF research campus, 800K sf city/neighborhood retail, 500-room hotel, 49 acres of open space, public school, across from Mission Creek Park.	San Francisco	Light Rail: MUNI Fourth and King	\$17,000,000	Rental Housing and Housing Infrastructure

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Brief Project Description	City	Qualifying Transit Mode/ Station	Total Award	Funding Type
South Hayward BART Mixed Use - Family & Senior	Eden Housing, Inc., Wittek Development, LLC & The Montana Property Group, LLC	Two buildings, 206 affordable rentals (125 for families at 20-50% of AMI, and 81 for seniors at 30-50% of AMI), 204 parking spaces, above Safeway grocery store, across from South Hayward Bart Station.	Hayward	Heavy Rail: South Hayward BART	\$17,000,000	Rental Housing
Curtis Park Village	City of Sacramento on Calvine & Elk Grove-Florin, LLC	131 market-rate ownership condos/townhomes, 90 affordable rentals targeted to seniors 55+ at 30-50% of AMI, 197 parking spaces. Part of 72-acre site planned for single- and multi-family and senior housing, with bridge connection to City College Light Rail Station, 60 parking spaces. Surrounded by Curtis Park neighborhoods on north and east, near neighborhood retail.	Sacramento	Light Rail: City College Station	\$9,085,000	Housing Infrastructure

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Brief Project Description	City	Qualifying Transit Mode/ Station	Total Award	Funding Type
Blvd 6200 - North	Foundation for Affordable Housing V, Inc	4 buildings, 535 total rentals (108 targeted to families at 35-50% of AMI plus 18 live-work rentals); 70,649 sf commercial/ retail space, 585 resident/781 commercial parking spaces, 7,000 sf pedestrian plaza, across the street from Hollywood/Vine Metro Red Line Transit Station.	Hollywood	Heavy Rail: Hollywood/ Vine Red Line	\$11,567,860	Rental Housing
5555 Hollywood	Meta Housing Corp., Western Community Housing, Inc & KD Housing Partners, Inc	5 stories, 120 rentals for seniors 55+ at 30% or 50% of AMI; 162 parking spaces, on-site senior programs, 6000 sf ground-floor retail. In "Little Armenia" area, one block from Red Line station, within 1 mile of retail/services.	Los Angeles	Metro Red Line: Hollywood/ Western Station	\$9,000,000	Rental Housing
Chinatown Metro Apts	Meta Housing Corp, Western Community Housing Corp, Value Housing II, LLC	Adaptive reuse of 1923 six-story and 1916 nine-story concrete buildings into 123 rentals for seniors at 35-60% of AMI; zero parking spaces. In LA's Chinatown neighborhood within 1/4 mile of light rail, and 1 mile of retail and services.	Los Angeles	Light Rail: Chinatown Station	\$3,614,848	Of larger request for Rental Housing, Housing and Transit Access Infrastructure, and Land Acq.
Long Beach & Anaheim TOD	Meta Housing Corp., Western Community Housing Inc., City of Long Beach	5 buildings, 356 total homes: 170 condos with 40 for moderate-income buyers, 119 market-rate senior rentals, and 67 rentals for 55+ at 30-60% of AMI; 388 parking spaces; on-site senior programs. In downtown Long Beach near light rail, within 1 mile of shopping, medical services, employment centers, parks and recreation.	Long Beach	Light Rail: Anaheim Street Station	\$3,614,848	Of larger request for Rental Housing, Housing Infrastructure, Homeownership

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Brief Project Description	City	Qualifying Transit Mode/ Station	Total Award	Funding Type
The Boulevard at North Park	Community Housing Works & The Association of Community Housing Solutions (TACHS)	Six stories, 175 rentals targeted to families at 35-60% of AMI; 246 resident/32 commercial parking spaces, on-site adult and youth programs, 12,066 sf commercial space. In North Park neighborhood, three blocks from Mid-City Rapid bus line between two employment centers.	San Diego	BRT: Texas St. Station	\$3,614,848	Rental Housing
15th and Commercial	S.V.D.P. Management, Inc. and Chelsea Investment Corp.	12 stories, 140 total homes: 75 rooms for 150 homeless men; 64 studios for those at 30-40% of AMI, with 25 as supported housing for individuals with serious mental illness; 3 guest units, other accessory uses. 16 parking spaces, 20 bike spaces, 3-floor child development center. Next to Joan Kroc Center 248-bed transitional housing shelter for homeless families. In downtown San Diego East Village neighborhood, less than 1/4-mile from light rail station.	San Diego	Light Rail: 12th and Imperial Transit Center	\$6,637,597	Rental Housing

Round 1: 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/ MPP	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.

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.
Cuatro Vientos	East Los Angeles Community Corporation	25 affordable apartments, a mix of 1-3 bedrooms, including public walkways and community space.	Los Angeles	\$1,028,366	So Cal	QIP	Residential parking structure, storm water mitigation plan.
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.
Crenshaw Mid-City Corridors Infill	CRA Los Angeles	60 units of senior housing, connecting it to transit stop at Coliseum St. and 30 th Street,	Los Angeles	\$14,677,920	So Cal	QIA	Pedestrian oriented improvements to light rail station, including sidewalks, irrigation, landscaping, and signage.

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/MPP	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.

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/MPP	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	\$20,961,940, including \$383,100 for parks	Central Valley	QIA/MPP	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.	Mantec a	\$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.	Portervil le	\$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 development.	Stockto n	\$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.

Round 2: 46 Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program Awards (June 2009)

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Project Name	Sponsor(s)	Brief Project Description	City	Total Award	Type/Location	Infrastructure Description
Ohlone Gardens	Resources for Community Development & City of El Cerrito RDA	57 total rentals including 46 targeted to households at 30-50% of AMI; residential training program for the visually impaired target population and a computer lab. One block from El Cerrito's San Pablo commercial corridor.	El Cerrito	\$2,860,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Environmental remediation, demolition of existing structures; site preparation; streetscape and sidewalk; podium parking structure.
Peralta Mixed-Use Senior Housing	Eden Housing, Inc.	98 apartments for seniors age 62+ at 20-35% of AMI, community facilities, senior supportive services and referrals, 0 parking spaces, one-half mile from the Centerville Business District.	Fremont	\$700,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Sewer, storm water extensions/construction; utility undergrounding; street improvements for widening of Peralta Blvd.; bike parking facility; streetscape improvements.
South Hayward BART Mixed-use	City of Hayward & City of Hayward RDA	5 stories, 788 total homes, including 204 rentals targeted to families and 80 for seniors at 30-50% of AMI; ground-floor supermarket and retail; within walking distance to multi-modal transit stations and shared car service; all within 1/2 mile of South Hayward BART station.	Hayward	\$30,000,000	MPP/Nor Cal	910-space BART replacement parking structure, offsite infrastructure; landscaping, utilities, pedestrian access and bus transfer facilities.

Red Star	National Affordable Communities & Linc Housing	119 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-60% of AMI; community center with health & exercise programs, medical screenings, counseling; 60 parking spaces; less than 1/2 mile from West Oakland BART station, public park, retail.	Oakland	\$1,500,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Ground-level parking structure; soil remediation due to lead, mercury and hydrocarbons.
720 East 11th Street Apts.	Resources for Community Development	55 rentals targeting families at 30-55% of AMI; computer lab, community room, laundry facilities. Less than half-mile of public park, school, employment and retail centers.	Oakland	\$1,537,549	QIP/Nor Cal	55-space parking garage; underground utility lines.
Siena Court Senior Apartments	Domus Development & Redevelopment Agency of the City of Pittsburg	110 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-60% of AMI; 100 parking spaces with a "green" roof; 10,379 sf of retail, in Old Town Pittsburg.	Pittsburg	\$4,994,560	QIP/Nor Cal	Design, engineering and construction of two-level parking garage; utility service connections; street enhancements; public plaza
Hunters View	Hunters View Associates LP	740 total homes: 390 ownership, including 59 targeted to low-income homebuyers, 350 rentals targeted to families at 50% of AMI, near BART station and SF public transit	San Francisco	\$30,000,000	MPP/Nor Cal	Infrastructure to be completely rebuilt; existing major utility systems will need to be demolished, replaced and brought up to current standards; all of the streets to be rebuilt; new streets will be added; streetscapes and site landscaping
333 Harrison	Harrison Fremont LLC	308 total rentals, including 62 targeted to families at 30% of AMI, on-site gym, green roof deck, parking structure, in downtown San Francisco at Caltrans staging area of the Bay Bridge.	San Francisco	\$11,559,600	MPP/Nor Cal	Demolition; excavation; surveying and grading, disposal of contaminated soils; new utilities.

Appendix I

Evaluation of California's TOD Housing and IIG Programs

5800 Third Street	SF Third Street Equity Partners LLC	223 total rentals, including 67 targeting families at 30% of AMI, near amenities, Muni station. In San Francisco's Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood.	San Francisco	\$10,433,280	QIP/Nor Cal	Utilities; sidewalk, curb and gutter improvements; landscaping; parking garage.
2235 3rd Street	Martin McNerney Properties, LLC	179 total rentals with 37 targeted to families at 30% of AMI, 157 parking spaces, on-site day care for the neighborhood. Adjacent to new Muni Third Street Light Rail Station.	San Francisco	\$7,378,080	QIP/Nor Cal	Water, sewer and utility service improvements and relocation, 179 parking spaces; transit linkages; sidewalk and streetscape improvements
Arc Light Co.	178 Townsend Properties, LLC	85 total rentals including 18 targeting families at 30% of AMI, 74 parking spaces. 1/2 block from Muni station in SF South of Market neighborhood adjacent to AT&T ballpark.	San Francisco	\$3,561,360	QIP/Nor Cal	Water, sewer, utilities; parking; transit linkages including bicycle storage units; traffic mitigation devices; sidewalk and streetscape improvements
North San Pedro Residential Project	City of San Jose RDA & North San Pedro Townhomes LLC	Five-phase project to develop 610 homes, including 134 rentals targeted to families at 30-50% of AMI, with 45 to serve special needs populations. Within 1/2-mile of St. James light rail station, 3 parks.	San Jose	\$24,160,400	MPP/Nor Cal	Complete street reconstruction; demo of existing streets; new street improvements (gutter, curb, sidewalks, lighting); three new parks that will link the development sites
Rosemary Housing	1st and Rosemary Family Housing, L.P.	288 rentals targeted to families at 30-60% of AMI, including 104 for seniors, 256 parking spaces, pool, courtyards, open spaces, 1.5 miles north of downtown San Jose near light rail.	San Jose	\$12,382,972	MPP/Nor Cal	Podium parking garage; landscaping and irrigation, sidewalks and fences, street improvements and utility connections; North San Jose Traffic Impact Fee

McCreery Courtyards	Central Valley Coalition for Affordable Housing	93 rentals targeting families at 50% of AMI, with 5 reserved for persons with disabilities. 93 parking spaces, 2,500 sf recreation center, on-site classes and after-school programs. Near public school, medical center, employment center, 1/2 mile from public park.	San Jose	\$3,720,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Engineering, design, grading, site and foundation work for podium-style parking structure.
New Railroad Square	City of Santa Rosa & Railroad Square Associates	279 total homes, including 68 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-60% of AMI with senior programs, 30,000 sf of retail including a public market-place, 229 parking spaces. By SMART rail stop in Santa Rosa's Railroad Square Historic District.	Santa Rosa	\$11,363,800	MPP/Nor Cal	Demolition; streets, curbs, gutters, lighting, traffic signal, sewer lines, storm drains and catch basins, water lines and dry utilities, streetscape and site landscaping; parking structure.
Fair Oaks Senior Housing	Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition	124 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-50% of AMI, 2000 sf of community facilities, services, adjacent to Fair Oaks Valley Medical Center.	Sunnyvale	\$6,600,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Subterranean parking garage; sewer/plumbing; pedestrian linkages; fire hydrant replacement; utility undergrounding; traffic lights, bus shelters; development impact fees.
Union City Station District	Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Union City & Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition	344 total rentals, including 155 targeted to families at 30-45% of AMI. Adjacent to a planned new entrance at the Union City BART Station	Union City	\$15,038,880	MPP/Nor Cal	Construction of a pass-through to provide direct access to BART.
Manzanita Self-Help Homes	Burbank Housing Development Corporation	22 mutual self-help ownership homes targeted to families earning less than 80% AMI; next to existing neighborhoods, near schools and parks.	Windsor	\$910,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Site preparation; water, sewer and utilities; surface improvements, landscaping; street and streetscape.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA: SACRAMENTO AREA

The Railyards	S Thomas Enterprises of Sacramento LLC	For Phase 1 with 141 rentals targeted to families at 30-60% of AMI, part of planned development of 11,000 total homes with 1,800 affordable rentals. Near proposed regional Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility with light rail, freight/passenger rail, and bus/taxi service.	Sacramento	\$20,000,000	MPP/Nor Cal	Access from each phase of housing to the Sacramento Valley Station; construction of streets, pedestrian plaza, and kiosk-style building linking the plaza to station boarding points.
Township 9	City of Sacramento	265 total rentals, including 90 targeted to families at 50% of AMI, in planned mixed use development within 1/2 mile of future light rail station.	Sacramento	\$10,900,000	QIA/Nor Cal	Site preparation, grading, excavation and soil import; sewer, water and storm drain, curb/gutter, sidewalk, paving and landscaping; street improvements and underground utilities
Parkside at City Center	Riverside Charitable Corporation	62 rentals targeting families at 60% of AMI with 4 accessible units, 62 parking spaces, community facilities. In West Sacramento's business district, part of the West Capital Streetscape Master Plan.	West Sacramento	\$1,900,000	QIP/Nor Cal	Engineering, design, grading, site and foundation work for podium-style parking structure.
Capitol Lofts	Capitol Lofts-Sacramento, LLC & Capital Area Development Authority	122 rentals including 37 targeted to families at 30% of AMI, 1/4 mile from light rail, public park, State Capitol.	Sacramento	\$4,946,080	QIP/Nor Cal	Sewer, water, storm improvements; surface improvements; landscaping infrastructure; multi-story parking garage.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mill Creek- Qualifying Infill Area	Bakersfield Redevelopment Agency	70 rentals targeted to households at 30-50% of AMI, 56 residential/34 public parking spaces, in downtown Bakersfield. Part of the Downtown Community Plan.	Bakersfield	\$10,847,200	QIA/So Cal	Park refurbishment and development; street improvements, curb and gutter, street trees, sidewalks, streetlights, landscaping, street resurfacing; parking structure.
Canyon Creek	Thomas Safran and Associates	75 rentals for seniors from 30-60% of AMI, near health center, hospital, shopping center in Calabasas.	Calabasas	\$3,653,280	QIP/So Cal	Water/sewer lines; transportation, sidewalk, streetscape improvements; landscaping and lighting; environmental remediation.
Long Beach and Anaheim Transit Oriented Development	Meta Housing Corporation & City of Long Beach	5 buildings, 356 total homes: 170 condos with 40 for moderate- income buyers, 119 market-rate senior rentals, and 67 rentals for 55+ at 30-60% of AMI; 388 parking spaces; on-site senior programs. In downtown Long Beach near light rail, within 1 mile of shopping, medical services, employment centers, parks and recreation.	Long Beach	\$15,069,280	MPP/So Cal	Street and sidewalk improvements; bus pullout lane; underground parking; sewer, water, and drainage improvements; sidewalk repaving; underground utilities; streetscape enhancement.
Blvd 6200- North	Clarette Hollywood, LLC	535 total rentals, including 108 targeted to families at 30% or 60% AMI or below, on-site fitness/recreation, 535 parking spaces, across from the Hollywood/Vine Red Line Metro Station.	Los Angeles	\$20,725,200	MPP/So Cal	Demolition; relocation/ expansion of utilities; street lighting, signage, and street tree relocation and replacement; sidewalk repairs; street, curb and gutter, storm drainage; structured parking

Taylor Yard Transit Village MPP	McCormack Baron Salazar, Inc.	430 total homes, including 69 rentals targeted to families and 107 targeted to seniors at 30-60% of AMI, 430 parking spaces, 29,400 sf of retail space, along the L.A. River.	Los Angeles	\$15,094,990	MPP/So Cal	Water, sewer, laterals for individual parcels, underground storm water chambers, electrical wiring, telephone, data and irrigation systems.
5555 Hollywood	Meta Housing Corp.	5 stories, 120 rentals for seniors 55+ at 30% or 50% of AMI; 162 parking spaces, on-site senior programs, 6000 sf ground-floor retail. In "Little Armenia" area, one block from Red Line station, within 1 mile of retail/services.	Los Angeles	\$5,000,000	QIP/So Cal	Semi-subterranean parking; site prep; sewer and storm drain improvements; sidewalks, parkway landscaping and street trees
Lorena Apartments	Global Premier Development & LINC Housing	112 rentals targeted to households at 30-60% of AMI; 243 parking spaces; near employment, retail, park elementary school and college.	Los Angeles	\$5,000,000	QIP/So Cal	Construction of two-level subterranean parking structure; 60% of soil removal.
Seventh & Coronado Family Apartments	Los Angeles Housing Partnership, Inc.	68 rentals targeted to families at 30% - 60% AMI located in the Westlake Recovery Project Area; amenities will include underground parking, community room and learning center	Los Angeles	\$3,886,267	QIP/So Cal	Relocation of street lights; street trees; underground parking; curb and gutter
Monticito Terraces	AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc.	69 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-60% of AMI; recreational/ educational programs, computer training, tax preparation classes, on-site basic health care, near public transportation, major health care facility and commercial outlets.	Los Angeles	\$3,033,600	QIP/So Cal	Infrastructure including sewer, storm drain and water connections; sidewalks and new curb and gutters; streetlights; subterranean parking structure with 69 spaces

Mosaic Apartments	AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc. & Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles	56 rentals targeted to families at 30-60% AMI, computer training, job training, ESL classes, and health and nutrition programs. In dense commercial corridor in L.A.'s Pico/Union area.	Los Angeles	\$2,732,400	QIP/So Cal	Sewer, water; sidewalks; streetlights; subterranean parking structure; impact fees.
Sunrise Apartments	AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc. & Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles	46 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-50% of AMI, LifeSTEPS to provide on-site senior center with free senior social services programming for a minimum of 10 years. In dense commercial corridor in Southeast Los Angeles.	Los Angeles	\$2,038,050	QIP/So Cal	Subterranean parking structure; alleyway improvements; utility connections and expansion; streetscape improvements; city impact fees.
Broadway Villas	AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc. & Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles	48 rentals targeted to seniors at 30-60% of AMI, 48 parking spaces, on-site senior center and community room. In Broadway/Manchester Recovery Redevelopment Project Area in south L.A.	Los Angeles	\$1,894,280	QIP/So Cal	Subterranean parking structure; impact fees; soft costs
The Villas at Gower	A Community of Friends & PATH Ventures	53 rentals targeted to homeless households where one adult has a disability, 16 for homeless or at-risk of homelessness, at 30% of AMI; 59 parking spaces, community space, near bus and light rail lines, special needs clinic, employment and retail.	Los Angeles	\$1,810,000	QIP/So Cal	Parking structure; offsite improvements including curb and gutter, sidewalk, street lights and trees; Disposition Agreement with RDA.
La Coruña Senior Apts.	La Coruna Senior Apts. LP	87 rentals for seniors at 30-60% of AMI, 52 parking spaces, educational services, community room, fitness center and computer room.	Panorama City	\$3,944,897	QIP/So Cal	Subterranean parking structure; site prep; curb and gutter, sidewalks, parkway landscaping and street trees

Sherman Village	Sherman Village Apts. LP	73 rentals targeted to families at 30-60% of AMI; 73 parking spaces, within 1/2-mile of park, public school.	Reseda	\$3,569,960	QIP/So Cal	Semi-subterranean parking, site preparation, clearing, excavation, and grading; sewer and storm drain; sidewalks, parkway landscaping and street trees.
Ballpark Village	Ballpark Village LLC	791 ownership homes with 34 targeted to low-income homebuyers; 134 rentals targeted to families at 30-60% of AMI, with 7 reserved for persons who are homeless, have HIV/AIDS or mental illness. In the Ballpark District of downtown San Diego's East Village.	San Diego	\$24,690,880	MPP/So Cal	Funding for 791 of required 1,188 parking spaces; environmental remediation
15th & Commercial	S.V.D.P. Management, Inc.	Mixed-use, 12 stories, 75 transitional rentals for formerly homeless individuals, 39 rentals for families at 30-40% of AMI, 25 rentals for tenants eligible under MHSA; less than 1/4-mile of 12th Street and Imperial Transit Center.	San Diego	\$3,089,027	QIP/So Cal	Demo of existing center; site preparation; enlarging utilities; street and curb/gutter/sidewalk perimeter improvements; subterranean garage; noise mitigation work.
Chinatown Yale/Ord Streets Pedestrian Linkage Project	CRA Los Angeles, Affirmed Housing	60 affordable units for 30-60% AMI in a 5 story structure.	Los Angeles	\$3,400,000	QIP/So Cal	Pedestrian walkway, landscaping, excavation, connect transit hub to housing.
National City	Related Companies, Community Housing Works	201 units of affordable housing in a TOD project near a trolley stop.	San Diego	\$11,238,516	MPP/ So Cal	Open space preservation, parking stalls, improved pedestrian access

CENTRAL VALLEY

Dinuba Senior Apts.	Chelsea Investment Corporation & City of Dinuba	66 rentals for seniors at 30-50% of AMI, community facilities, in center of Dinuba.	Dinuba	\$2,400,000	QIP/Central Valley	Alley reconstruction for walking access to Transit Hub & Dinuba Vocational Center; bus shelters; sewer, storm drainage and water systems; infrastructure, street improvements, curb & gutter, pedestrian walkway
Chinatown Lofts	Fresno Historic Chinatown, LLC & Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno	Mixed use, 68 rentals targeting families at 30-60% of AMI in a redevelopment area of Downtown Fresno.	Fresno	\$4,038,640	QIP/Central Valley	Site preparation including ingress and egress ramps, lighting, sidewalks and landscaping.
Transit Village	City of Fresno & ROEM Development	133 rentals for seniors at 30-60% of AMI, on-site arts and crafts, health/fitness and computer education. By planned state-of-the-art bus transfer station.	Fresno	\$3,006,433	QIP/Central Valley	Impact fees, soft and hard costs for new bus transit center; public park landscaping and irrigation; sidewalk and fence; utility connections.
Lindsay Centennial Infill Project	City of Lindsay	282 total homes, including 79 rentals targeted to families at 50% of AMI, adjacent to health clinic, medical/dental offices, new community pool, renovated public park, golf course and wellness center in the urban core of Lindsay.	Lindsay	\$4,604,253	QIA/Central Valley	Site preparation, utilities, streets, curb/gutter, sidewalks, landscaping, streetscape; development & rehabilitation of parks, open spaces.

Gentrification Risk Assessment (by Census Tract*) of TOD Awarded Project: Developed by Karen Chapple, UC Berkeley

TOD Award Round	Project Name	City	Already Gentrified 1990-2000*	Risk of Gentrification (5 = Highest Risk)	RISK FACTOR 1: % of workers taking transit > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 2: % nonfamily households > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 3: % 3+ units in buildings > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 4: % renter occupancy > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 5: % rent-burdened households > regional avg
1	Rosslyn Lofts	Los Angeles	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	Ten - Fifty B	San Diego	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	MacArthur Park B	Los Angeles	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	MacArthur Transit Village	Oakland	Yes	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	Bonnie Brae Apartments	Los Angeles	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	The Railyards	Sacramento	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	The Railyards	Sacramento	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	15th and Commercial	San Diego	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Golden Gate Avenue (Central YMCA)	San Francisco	Yes	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	5555 Hollywood	Los Angeles	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Blvd 6200 - North	Hollywood	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	Grand Avenue Apartments	Los Angeles	Yes	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	Commercial 22	San Diego	No	4	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
1	MacArthur Park Metro Apartments Phase A	Los Angeles	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
1	Coliseum BART Station Transit Village	Oakland	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Census Tract: Census designation of an area that is smaller than a county

**Tracts that have already gentrified are (1) in the central city; (2) have 1990-2000 increases in educational attainment beyond the regional average; (3) have 1990-2000 increases in housing appreciation above the regional average; and (4) started in 1990 below 80% of Area Median Income.

TOD Award Round	Project Name	City	Already Gentrified 1990-2000?*	Risk of Gentrification (5 = Highest Risk)	RISK FACTOR 1: % of workers taking transit > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 2: % nonfamily households > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 3: % 3+ units in buildings > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 4: % renter occupancy > regional avg	RISK FACTOR 5: % rent-burdened households > regional avg
1	Lion Creek Crossing	Oakland	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	1000 Fourth Street Family Housing	San Francisco	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Chinatown Metro Apts	Los Angeles	Yes	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	South Hayward BART Mixed Use - Family & Senior	Hayward	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Long Beach & Anaheim TOD	Long Beach	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1	San Leandro Crossings	San Leandro	No	3	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
1	Chinatown Blossom Plaza	Los Angeles	No	3	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
2	The Boulevard at North Park	San Diego	No	3	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
1	Armstrong Place Senior Housing	San Francisco	Yes	2	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
1	Trestle Glen *App Withdrawn	Colma	No	2	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
2	Curtis Park Village	Sacramento	No	2	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Union City Intermodal Station District	Union City	No	1	No	No	No	Yes	No

*Tracts that have already gentrified are (1) in the central city; (2) have 1990-2000 increases in educational attainment beyond the regional average; (3) have 1990-2000 increases in housing appreciation above the regional average; and (4) started in 1990 below 80% of Area Median Income

Density Range Scoring

Numbers in the shaded area are either the potential points (or, if listed with a development name, the actual points awarded) for the specified "population per square mile of land area" and "transit mode."

	Population per square mile of land area									
	0-1000	1001-2000	2001-3000	3001-4000	4001-5000	5001-6000	6001-8000	8001-10000	10000-13000	13,001+
Transit Mode										
Heavy Rail (BART, METRO Red Line)	29	31	33	37	41 points: Union City	44	48 points: Coliseum BART Lion Creek Crossing	50 points: MacArthur Transit Village Trestle Glen 1000 Fourth St. Chinatown Metro Apts	53	55 points: Grand Avenue Rosslyn Lofts MacArthur Park A MacArthur Park B Bonnie Brae Golden Gate Ave. South Hayward BART Blvd. 6200 5555 Hollywood
Light Rail/ Bus Rapid Transit	21	22	23	27 points: The Railyards	31	35	38 points: Curtis Park Village 15th and Commercial	42 points: Long Beach/AnaheimTOD Comm 22 Ten Fifty B	46	50 points: Armstrong Place
Rapid Bus / Express Bus	20	20	20	22	24	26	28	30	33	36
Commuter Rail (Capitol Corridor, Caltrain, Metrolink, Surfliner, Coaster), Ferry, Non-Express Bus Hub	19	19	19	20	22	24	26	27	29	30

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 telecommunications, 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 high frequency bus hub or corridor 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 sidewalks, lighting, 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.

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

TOD/IIG Advisory Committee Members for Rounds 1 and 2

- Bob Allen and Vu-Bang Nguyen, Urban Habitat
- Susan Baldwin, San Diego Association of Governments
- Dena Belzer, Strategic Economics
- Karen Chapple, UC Berkeley
- James Corless, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Jeff Hobson, TransForm
- Shelley Poticha and Abigail Thorne-Lyman, Reconnecting America
- Beth Steckler, ClimatePlan
- Sarah Truehaft, PolicyLink

Land Use and Finance Working Group for Rounds 1 and 2

- 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 Lyons, 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