MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

The Regional Planning TWG may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, January 11, 2007

1:15 – 3:15 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor
(619) 699-1989
cgr@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- STATEWIDE PROPOSITIONS SUPPORTIVE OF HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH
- BOARD POLICY NO. 033 IMPLEMENTATION
- UPDATE ON REGIONAL HOUSING ACTIVITIES

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
ITEM #          RECOMMENDATION

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

   Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

   Comment

   Consent Item

   +3. SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 14, 2006, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

       The TWG should review and approve the attached meeting summary.

   Approve

   Report Items (4 through 6)

   +4. STATEWIDE PROPOSITIONS SUPPORTIVE OF HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH (Susan Baldwin)

       On November 7, 2006, Proposition 1C (Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006) and other infrastructure-related bond propositions were approved by the voters. The attached report discusses the smart growth and housing-supportive aspects of Propositions 1C and 84, how the San Diego region will benefit from these funds, and what local jurisdictions and SANDAG will need to do to ensure that the region gets its fair share of the funds.

   Discussion

   +5. BOARD POLICY NO. 033 IMPLEMENTATION (Susan Baldwin)

       Staff and TWG members will discuss issues related to the implementation of SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 that were raised during the December meeting.

   Discussion

   +6. UPDATE ON REGIONAL HOUSING ACTIVITIES (Susan Baldwin)

       The attached report provides an overview of SANDAG’s current housing-related activities. These activities include: collaboration with universities and housing advocacy groups; review of state and federal housing - and smart growth-related legislation; implementation of the RHNA Board Policy No. 033; work on the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Strategic Plan and I-15 Interregional Partnership; and assistance with the baseline performance monitoring report for the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

   Information

   7. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

       The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, February 8, 2007, from 1:15 – 3:15 p.m.

   Information

   +next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 14, 2006, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING  File Number 3000200

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Jim Sandoval, City of Chula Vista, chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications
There were no public comments.

CONSENT ITEMS (3)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the October 12, 2006 Technical Working Group Meeting

Agenda Item #4: California Regional Blueprint Planning Program Grant Renewal Application

Agenda Item #5: Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Baseline Monitoring Report
A motion and second were made to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR REPORT (6 through 8)

Agenda Item #6: Recognition of Jeff Tayman for His Service to SANDAG
SANDAG staff and TWG members congratulated and presented Mr. Tayman with a certificate of appreciation.

Agenda Item #7: Recognition of Dennis Turner’s Service on the TWG
SANDAG staff and TWG members congratulated and presented Mr. Turner with a certificate of appreciation.
**Agenda Item #8: Planning Commissioners Lunch Workshop: The ABC’s of Regional Planning in San Diego**

The San Diego Section of the American Planning Association (APA), the Planning Directors Association (PDA), SANDAG, and Caltrans are working together to host a workshop luncheon for planning commissioners, citizen planners, and local planning staffs focused on regional planning in San Diego. The workshop will be held on Friday, January 19, 2007, at the new Caltrans District 11 building from 11 a.m. – 2 p.m. Planning directors interested in enrolling their staff members in this workshop should contact Lance Schulte.

Questions and comments included:

Rosemary Rowan, County of San Diego, asked how the planning commissioners are being contacted. Bob Leiter, SANDAG, stated that invitations have been sent out; however, they were not directed to planning directors individually. It is a good idea to send it out directly.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, stated that this workshop was discussed at the APA luncheon. There was also a discussion of whether APA should maintain a list of planning commissioners. The Working Group concluded that a good option would be to ask commissioner’s whether they are interested on being on the contact list.

Lance Schulte, North County Transit District, stated that at the APA board meeting, they received confirmation that the League of California Cities was going to send out the invitation to all city managers to encourage the attendance of their planning commissioners. The League is a co-sponsor of the workshop.

Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado, suggested that attendance not be limited to only planning commissioners; other commissioners may want to attend.

Mr. Schulte stated that he will compile all of the speaker’s information into a portfolio on the APA Web site that will be accessible to everyone after the workshop.

**REPORTS (9 through 13)**

**Agenda Item #9: Reports from Technical Working Group Members**

Bill Anderson, City of San Diego, stated that the City Council approved the city’s housing element on December 5.

Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District, stated that they are in the process of submitting a State Implementation Plan showing compliance with the ozone eight hour standard.

Mr. Leiter stated that he recently attended the Regional Blueprint Learning Network meeting where the idea of addressing environmental issues through general plans was discussed. He added that air quality and energy planning were areas of interest at the state level to promote coordination among land use and transportation plans. Mr. Leiter stated that there is a good opportunity for the TWG to work with the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) to develop more specific strategies as well as opportunities to obtain state funding for these issues.
Mr. Hamilton noted that if the ACPD cannot show that they are meeting the standard, there will be real financial penalties. He also stated that with Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the air districts are left out of the CO2 and greenhouse gas tracking and regulation. Mr. Hamilton stated that the Air Resources Board is hiring about 100 new people to address those issues specifically.

Ms. Rowan commented that Proposition 90 or something similar could come back again next November with significant implications for general plans, with the potential elimination of long-range planning. She added that there was not a lot of action on the part of professional organizations to campaign against it. Robert Larkins, City of Lemon Grove, noted that Proposition 90 actually passed in San Diego County.

Jim Griffin, City of El Cajon, stated that El Cajon has had its housing element found in compliance with state law by the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

**Agenda Item #10: General Plan Subcommittee Status Report**

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, informed the TWG that the subcommittee met and proposed a simplistic approach regarding whether a local jurisdiction’s general plan is current.

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, stated that after discussing all the questions, it was determined that they were designed to show how a jurisdiction is not in compliance or its general plan is out of date. The question the subcommittee agreed upon allows for explanations as opposed to yes or no answers.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, noted that there were two reasons for asking this question. She stated that SANDAG wanted to get an idea of the status of local general plans in conjunction with the growth forecast, and because there is a housing shortage forecasted, staff wanted to have some idea of whether some general plans would be updated to help address that issue or not. Ms. Clementson also stated that Gary Gallegos is in Sacramento often and there is a general impression at the state level that most general plans are out of date. SANDAG wanted to ensure that Mr. Gallegos had a good sense of whether or not that is true in the San Diego region. She stated that the subcommittee determined that this new question provides jurisdictions with an opportunity to show steps being taken to keep their general plans current.

Mr. Kleeman commented that the previous questions implied that if a jurisdiction had not updated its plans recently, that would mean they were not current. He added that the subcommittee was concerned that the more detailed the question was, the more defensive the answer would seem. Mr. Kleeman stated that the subcommittee felt that the more open-ended question would allow a jurisdiction to provide a more accurate response.

Ms. Clementson stated that with the group’s approval, SANDAG will email the question to each jurisdiction for a response.

Ms. Niles stated that jurisdictions may also want to add when responding to this question that planned future updates will be conducted to ensure that plans are current.
Mr. Hamilton stated that this information would be useful to other agencies and asked if it would be available on the SANDAG Web site. Ms. Clementson responded that the group should discuss and decide on whether/how to make the information available after the survey has been completed.

Mr. Kleeman stated that he was concerned with the idea that a response that highlights non-compliance by a jurisdiction will open the door to a legal attack on the general plan. Mr. Leiter stated that if a jurisdiction answers yes, then there should not be a legal challenge. He added that plans are regularly updated, and the response can be written in a way where the general plan will not be subject to legal challenge.

The TWG approved the proposed question regarding the status of general plans.

Agenda Item #11: Update on Housing Issues

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, made the presentation on housing issues in Susan Baldwin’s absence.

a) Update on the Implementation of RHNA Board Policy No. 033 - A letter was sent to the planning/community development directors with copies sent to the city managers and public works directors to remind them that the RHNA Board Policy will affect the upcoming TDA/TransNet Bicycle Funds, applications for which are due on February 5, 2007.

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Backoff asked if the number of units that jurisdictions report producing will be used to award funding. Ms. Clementson stated that jurisdictions that do not have a certified housing element cannot compete for the TDA funds. Points are awarded by the percentage of the total number of lower income housing units that each jurisdiction produced in relation to the RHNA numbers.

Ms. Rowan asked whether SANDAG wanted jurisdictions to report the number of units or types of units produced. Ms. Clementson stated that SANDAG would like the type and affordability of units produced. Ms. Rowan stated that would be problematic because you do not always have that information unless there is subsidized housing.

Ms. Clementson stated that SANDAG is not asking for information above and beyond what the jurisdictions already provide to the state.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, stated that we need to come to a conclusion on a theoretical family size, so that jurisdictions can determine the income and calculate the affordability of these units. There may need to be a loop-back to ensure consistency in calculating affordability.

Mr. Anderson stated that price points are not available for market-rate housing that is affordable, and the City of San Diego can only report on the inclusionary housing units produced.

Mr. Leiter suggested holding a meeting with the jurisdictions in January to follow up on the RHNA numbers and to make reasonable approximations of income categories based on housing type.
Mr. Anderson stated that a lot of the increase in affordable housing comes from people moving up and the existing units become available for people with lower incomes, but this is not reflected in the new production numbers. He mentioned that the only source that tracks market rate prices for housing is “DataQuick” and that maybe SANDAG could purchase the data since it has information for the entire county.

Mr. Kleeman stated that there does not seem to be a reason for a jurisdiction to respond if they do not have a housing element.

Barbara Redlitz, City of Escondido, asked if the short form of the application is something SANDAG wants prior to the application deadline. Ms. Clementson replied yes.

Mr. Chopyk stated that if a jurisdiction reports the number of building permits, it will yield a higher number than reporting certificates of occupancy. He asked the Working Group how they are reporting their housing unit numbers and stated that he thinks the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) is ultimately concerned with the number of units actually built. Mr. Chopyk also commented that the form should have the name of the jurisdiction on it.

Mr. Sandoval stated that this is becoming an issue in the San Diego region where housing units are not being built after people have pulled the permit and they are asking for extensions to keep the project alive. Ms. Niles added that in some communities building departments do not issue certificates of occupancy for residential units, only for commercial units. Ms. Niles stated that she recalled Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, had discussed with the Working Group that jurisdictions that had a draft housing element could compete for the grants.

Mr. Kleeman asked when the next round of funding begins. Ms. Clementson stated that the Transportation Development Act (TDA) call for projects occurs in January/February of every year, but every time there is a competitive grant program that is subject to Board Policy No. 033, SANDAG will ask for these numbers.

Mr. Turner asked if jurisdictions are reporting only the lower income housing units or breaking out the number of low from very low units. Ms. Clementson responded that the low and very low are grouped together for the purpose of determining bonus points.

Mr. Leiter stated that Susan Baldwin and staff will hold a workshop in January to help everyone understand SANDAG Policy No. 033. SANDAG wants to ensure that jurisdictions have opportunities to update their information prior to the next round of grants. He added that if this information is submitted to SANDAG by February, the information is good for the rest of the year. Jurisdictions that do not have their housing element completed by February, but are able to complete them before the next grant program, will be eligible for those funds.

Mr. Batchelder stated that in the next coming months it may be beneficial to discuss and evaluate the system in which points are awarded under Board Policy No. 033. Ms. Clementson stated that SANDAG reviews the policies every year.

Mr. Anderson suggested that SANDAG purchase DataQuick information, which would be less expensive than each jurisdiction individually collecting the information. Mr. Leiter stated that is something that SANDAG can look into and get back to jurisdictions prior to the meeting in January.
b) Smart Growth/Housing Forum - SANDAG’s Regional Housing Working Group is planning a smart growth/housing forum which is centered on how community members and developers can work together to implement smart growth projects. Ms. Clementson stated that staff is planning on bringing the PLACE3S tool back to the TWG early next year and it may be used in this forum to help in the decision-making process.

Questions and comments included:

Ms. Rowan asked if the PLACE3S tool is similar to what is used in the Bay Area. Ms. Clementson responded that the PLACE3S tool was used in Sacramento to create their regional plan and that the state has taken a real interest in how successful that was in making good decisions. SANDAG has been awarded some grant funding to test whether this model can work in more community-based planning.

Mr. Kleeman asked if the forum would be intended to improve staff training. Ms. Clementson stated it may be useful for staff training and possibly planning commissioners who are involved in the process, and may build upon the APA forum. She added that the date of this forum is still being discussed, but that it may occur in March.

Mr. Sandoval stated that the City of Chula Vista is having difficulty getting developers to adhere to the city’s policies on smart growth, and to seeing the benefits of smart growth for certain projects. He stated that he was impressed by the resources other regions have to deal with these issues at the California APA Conference and asked if there have been any thoughts to bring similar resources to the San Diego region. Mr. Leiter responded that in the PLACE3S land use model, you can build in outputs regarding return on investment with different land uses and densities, as well as different scales of development. He stated that in the Sacramento area, these outputs were used to interact with the building and development community to show how smart growth can work from a financial standpoint.

Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, stated that the League of California Cities Planning Commissioners meeting is being held in San Diego in March and that we should avoid conflicting with this meeting.

c) Housing Element Meeting with the League of California Cities - SANDAG has discussed the idea of holding a housing element meeting with the League of California Cities to discuss local jurisdiction experiences with the 2005-2010 cycle. Ms. Clementson stated that SANDAG will plan a meeting for any jurisdiction or the entire group to discuss this topic.

No questions or comments were made regarding this item.

d) Housing Performance Monitoring - In the past, SANDAG has prepared reports on the production of affordable housing for very low and low income households by jurisdiction. The TWG is asked to discuss the preparation of such a report for the 1999-2004 housing element cycle. This report would help determine the amount of very low and low income housing that was produced in relation to the RHNA numbers given our current financial resources and use of regulatory measures.
Questions and comments included:

No questions or comments were made.

Ms. Clementson stated that the Regional Planning Committee meeting on January 5, 2007, will be a joint meeting with the Regional Housing Working Group. SANDAG staff will be providing both groups with an update on the housing work program, as well as the California State Propositions as they pertain to housing and smart growth. She also added that there will be a presentation on the regional housing market. TWG members are invited to attend.

Agenda Item #12: 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Proposed Transit Strategy for 2030 Unconstrained Network

Linda Culp, SANDAG staff, presented the TWG with the proposed transit strategy for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) unconstrained network. Following completion of the Independent Transit Planning Review, staff developed a number of initial transit scenarios to explore how to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of transit in the 2007 RTP. The proposed transit strategy was approved by SANDAG’s Transportation Committee at its December 8, 2006, meeting.

Questions and comments included:

Ms. Culp made a clarification during her presentation regarding the Urban Core Area and stated that this was defined by the Metropolitan Transit System Comprehensive Operational Analysis (MTS COA), but includes the cities of San Diego (Downtown, Mid City, Mission Valley, La Jolla, and University Center), Imperial Beach, Chula Vista, National City, Coronado, La Mesa, part of Lemon Grove, El Cajon, Escondido, and Oceanside. She also clarified that the Downtown-Kearny Mesa Transit Guideway will most likely not be the final alignment. Staff modeled this guideway as running along State Route 94 and Market Street, then north via 5th Avenue, Bachman Drive to Fashion Valley and then along State Route 163.

Ms. Rowan asked if the models include build-out numbers of local jurisdictions and how that is reflected in transit ridership numbers. Ms. Culp stated that these numbers include jurisdictions’ currently adopted general plans. Mr. Leiter added that these do not include potential smart growth areas; however, in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2007 RTP, SANDAG will be developing an alternative that includes the existing/planned and potential smart growth areas to illustrate how the transit ridership and overall transit system will be affected by those land use changes.

Mr. Anderson stated that the City of San Diego could use some assistance in identifying mitigation measures that can enhance transit service. Mr. Leiter stated that a good example of mitigation measures is the Downtown Community Plan update, where adjustments to impact fees were made to provide funds to make continued improvements to the transportation system downtown.
Mr. Kleeman asked if technology similar to gift cards where money can be added electronically can be used to make using transit easier. Ms. Culp stated that implied in this strategy, is the Compass Card, which is a debit-like card where you can purchase a certain number of trips. In the long-range plan, this is a basic assumption that transit service can be increased due to people having these cards and not fumbling with change.

Ms. Rowan asked what data supports the increase to a three-plus requirement for the HOV lanes. She also asked if there is data to show that the three-plus requirement works and is the reason for the shift to three-plus because the HOV lanes are too congested. Ms. Culp stated that the three-plus requirement is in response to comments made by the Independent Transit Peer Review panel, and is a different approach to managed lanes. She added that SANDAG does not see the three-plus requirement being a strategy for the San Diego region at this time. Mr. Leiter added that the peer review panel suggested that the managed lanes would make driving cars more attractive, which led SANDAG to test other alternatives to change how we used our managed lanes system. Ms. Rowan also asked if the build-out of the potential smart growth areas occurs, would SANDAG consider an alternative transit plan. Mr. Leiter stated that staff is using currently adopted general plans and will monitor land uses between now and the next RTP update. Staff has taken the approach that it is better to be realistic about plans; with each update we will be able to demonstrate progress.

**Agenda Item #13: 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Energy White Paper**

Susan Freedman, SANDAG staff, presented the TWG with a presentation on energy and climate change impacts associated with transportation, alternative fuel and vehicle considerations, and potential energy-saving and emission-reducing measures. These issues identified in the 2007 RTP will be addressed further through an update of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES).

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Chopyk commented that airports are hot spots for emissions due to all of the activity that occurs. He stated that the extension of the Trolley to the airport would be a good place to start in reducing emissions. Mr. Chopyk also asked what the consequences are if the region exceeds the limit for CO2 emissions under the new state law. Ms. Freedman responded that the government has not decided on what the penalty or incentive structure will be yet. She mentioned that the governor recently signed a pact for California to work with other regions on market-based solutions. Ms. Freedman stated that local public utilities are under different requirements and receive penalties under the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

Ms. Rowan suggested that individual decisions regarding the purchasing of personal vehicles need to change and that perhaps public education programs should be conducted to find out why people are buying larger vehicles.

Mr. Schulte commented that he worked with a colleague in London, where they have a carbon tax, and he ended up selling his vehicle due to this. He stated that a lot can be done through registration fees and taxes.
Chris Schmidt, Caltrans, stated that the change over to different fuel types will impact the amount of fuel taxes collected. This will be a significant issue over the long-term and a national policy may be necessary. He added that this will affect revenues in the region. Ms. Freedman stated that this concept has come up and staff is aware of this possibility.

Gary Halbert, City of Santee, commented that the Orange County case referred to in the presentation has moved down to local projects, and there was a case in Banning where the EIR was found to be inadequate because it did not deal with global warming. He also suggested placing a larger emphasis on demand management and trip reduction.

Mr. Kleeman stated that everyone should recognize the general pollution issue and consider the impact of particulates. Also, technologies that have beneficial impacts on these issues should be pursued. Ms. Freedman stated that this white paper is in addition to the air quality and conformity section of the RTP.

**Agenda Item #14: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, January 11, 2007, from 1:15 – 3:15pm.
STATEWIDE PROPOSITIONS SUPPORTIVE OF HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH

Introduction

Attached is the January 5, 2007, report to the Regional Planning Committee entitled Statewide Propositions Supportive of Housing and Smart Growth.

Attachment: Regional Planning Committee Agenda Item 8 dated January 5, 2007
STATEWIDE PROPOSITIONS SUPPORTIVE OF HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH

Introduction

On November 7, 2006, Proposition 1C (The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006) and Proposition 84 (The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006) were approved by the voters. These propositions, along with Propositions 1A, 1B, 1D, and 1E, will provide substantial infrastructure funds to the San Diego region and the rest of the state. This report provides information on the bond funds from Propositions 1C and 84 that could be used to support smart growth and housing in the San Diego region. It also describes how these funds are expected to be allocated, the types of projects that could be funded, and SANDAG’s proposed strategies for accessing these funds (Attachments 1 and 2).

Discussion

Proposition 1C - The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 ($2.85 Billion)

In 2002, voters approved Proposition 46, which provided a total of $2.1 billion of general obligation bonds to fund state housing programs. All but about $350 million of those funds were unspent as of November 1, 2006. Approval of Proposition 1C in November 2006 provides $1.5 billion in continued funding for the Proposition 46 programs, as well as $1.35 billion for three new programs aimed at increasing housing development in the state. The programs and the potential for providing funding for affordable housing and capital improvements supporting new housing in the San Diego region are described below.

Affordable Housing Programs - $1.5 Billion: Homeownership Programs, Multifamily Housing Programs, and Other Housing Programs (Continued Funding for Proposition 46 Programs)

The affordable housing programs are administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), and with the exception of the $100 million Affordable Housing Innovation Fund, they provide continued funding for the programs developed under Proposition 46. The Homeownership Programs ($625 million) encourage homeownership for low- and moderate-income homebuyers by providing down payment assistance to homebuyers through low-interest loans or grants. The Multifamily Housing Programs ($590 million) provide funding for programs aimed at the construction or renovation of rental housing projects, such as apartment buildings. Local
governments, nonprofit organizations, and private developers are provided low-interest (3 percent) loans to fund part of the construction cost in exchange for reserving units for low-income households for a period of 55 years. Funding priority is given to projects in already developed areas and near existing public services such as public transportation. Other housing programs funded by Proposition 1C ($285 million) will provide loans and grants to the developers of homeless shelters and housing for farmworkers. A new program also falls into this category, the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund ($100 million), which provides competitive grants or loans to pilot projects aimed at reducing the costs of affordable housing through innovative cost-saving approaches. This program requires further legislation to develop specific criteria that establishes eligibility for use of the funds.

With respect to the Proposition 46 funds allocated to date, the San Diego region has received approximately $118 million in awards over the past four years (about 8 percent of the funds awarded statewide), resulting in assistance to 4,003 individuals and families in the form of new or renovated affordable units, homeownership assistance, and homeless shelter beds. (Additional Proposition 46 funds were scheduled to be allocated in December 2006.) Assuming the region receives 8 percent of the $1.5 billion of Proposition 1C’s affordable housing funds, the region stands to receive approximately $120 million during the next few years. This amount in conjunction with other affordable housing funds (redevelopment set-aside, low-income housing tax credits, etc.) will provide funding for only a portion of the 42,491 very low and low-income housing needs projected for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle. During the 1999-2004 housing element cycle only about 5,800 new homes were constructed for very low and low-income households—16 percent of the need (36,282) as identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). These figures illustrate the need for Proposition 1C funds in the San Diego region.

SANDAG staff will participate in the review of criteria as opportunities arise for the homeownership and Multifamily Housing Programs undertaken by HCD and/or CalHFA to ensure that they are consistent with and supportive of the Regional Comprehensive Plan’s smart growth and housing objectives and that the region receives its fair share of funds from a geographic perspective. We also will participate in discussions regarding the implementing legislation for the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund.

Development Programs - $1.35 Billion: Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentive Account ($850 Million); Transit-Oriented Development Account ($300 Million); and Housing Urban-Suburban-and-Rural Parks Account ($200 Million)

The purpose of these three new programs is to provide funds aimed at increasing development of new housing. Most of the funds are targeted for development projects in existing urban areas and near public transportation. The programs would provide loans and grants for a wide variety of projects, such as parks, water, sewage treatment, transportation, and housing. The San Diego region is well-positioned to use these funds to help implement development in the areas identified on the RCP’s Smart Growth Concept Map.

The Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentive Account ($850 million) will provide grants for capital improvement projects related to infill housing and other related infill development (with no more than $200 million for park projects), and brownfield cleanup that promotes infill housing and other related infill development. The Housing Urban-Suburban-and-Rural Parks Account ($200 million) will provide funds for housing-related parks in urban,
suburban, and rural areas. Like the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund, these programs both require implementing legislation to determine the conditions and criteria that will be used to allocate the funds in these accounts. As noted in the introduction, SANDAG is participating in discussions regarding this legislation.

The Transit-Oriented Development Account ($300 million) will provide funds for a Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program to be administered by HCD. The purpose of the program is to provide local assistance to cities, counties, transit agencies, and developers to develop or facilitate the development of higher-density uses with close proximity to transit stations. Grants can be made to local jurisdictions or transit agencies for the provision of infrastructure, or loans can be made for the development and construction of a housing project within one-quarter mile of a transit station, in which at least 15 percent of the units in the proposed development shall be affordable to very low or low-income households for at least 55 years. Criteria for these funds include the extent to which the project or development will increase public transit ridership and minimize automobile trips. In addition, bonus points will be granted to projects or developments that are in an area designated by the council of governments for infill development as part of a regional plan. The grant part of this program appears to be similar to SANDAG’s Smart Growth Incentive Program. Staff will work with other stakeholders and HCD staff in the development of guidelines for this program; no implementing legislation is required.

Proposition 84: The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006: Chapter 9. Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Reduction ($580 Million)

Proposition 84 ($5.388 billion) includes a chapter entitled Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Reduction, which provides $580 million in funds for improving the sustainability and livability of California’s communities through investment in natural resources. The purposes of this chapter include reducing urban communities’ contribution to global warming and increasing their adaptability to climate change while improving quality of life. The three programs included in this chapter are described below.

Local and regional parks ($400 million) is a competitive program focused on the acquisition and development of new parks and the expansion of overused parks in underserved communities. The creation of parks in neighborhoods where none exist will receive preference. No additional legislation will be required for these funds, which will be allocated by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Urban greening projects ($90 million) that reduce energy consumption, conserve water, improve air and water quality, and provide other community benefits will be funded through planning grants. Priority will be given to projects that provide multiple benefits, use existing public lands, serve communities with the greatest need, and facilitate joint use of public resources and investments including schools.

The third program, planning grants and planning incentives for regional and local land use plans ($90 million) will promote water conservation, reduce automobile use and fuel consumption, encourage greater infill and compact development, protect natural resources and agricultural lands, and revitalize urban and community centers.
Implementing legislation is required for these two $90 million programs, both of which are supportive of SANDAG's RCP and smart growth policies. As with the Proposition 1C programs that require additional legislation, SANDAG is participating in discussions regarding this legislation.

**Next Steps**

As described above, the San Diego region is eligible for substantial infrastructure funds from Propositions 1C and 84 that will help implement the RCP's smart growth and housing goals. To ensure our fair share, however, SANDAG will need to actively participate in the development of the allocation criteria for the funds, and SANDAG and the local jurisdictions will need to be aggressive in applying for them.

A key focus of SANDAG’s current efforts is on the programs described above that require implementing legislation. Three funding programs totaling $1.15 billion associated with Proposition 1C (Affordable Housing Innovation Fund; Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentive Account; and Housing Urban-Suburban-and-Rural Parks Account), and two funding programs totaling $180 million associated with Proposition 84 (urban greening projects and planning grants and planning incentives for regional and local land use plans) require implementing legislation to determine how these funds will be allocated and spent.

SANDAG staff is involved in discussions that will guide this future legislation with the California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG), the League of California Cities (LCC), and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC). Staff is working to ensure that these funds are used to implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Smart Growth Concept Map, and to help meet the region’s affordable housing needs. Staff also believes that it may be beneficial to allocate some of these funds (such as the $850 million Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentive Account) through block grants to regional planning agencies such as SANDAG. These funds could then be allocated by SANDAG in conjunction with the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program for infrastructure needs in the Existing/Planned Smart Growth Areas, and for planning activities in the Potential Smart Growth Areas.

The San Diego region has numerous projects that will qualify for funding from these bond programs including infrastructure projects in Existing/Planned Smart Growth Areas, plan amendments and specific plans in Potential Smart Growth Areas, park projects in smart growth and infill areas, Transit-Oriented Development housing and infrastructure projects, and affordable housing developments that address the region’s very low and low-income housing needs.

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Attachments:**
1. Proposition 1C Matrix
2. Proposition 84 Matrix

**Key Staff Contact:** Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
# Proposition 1C Matrix - Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 ($2.85 Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Section</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Purpose</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation Process</th>
<th>Potential San Diego Projects</th>
<th>Proposed SANDAG Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Programs - 53545 (b); (c); and (d) ($1.35 Billion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentive Account 53545 (b)</td>
<td>$850 M</td>
<td>The funds may be used for the following purposes: (1) Infill incentive grants for capital outlay related to infill housing development and other related infill development, and (2) Brownfield cleanup that promotes infill housing development and other related infill development consistent with regional and local plans. ($200M maximum for parks.)</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Implementing legislation</td>
<td>Smart Growth Incentive Program projects in Existing/Planned Smart Growth Areas on Smart Growth Concept Map</td>
<td>Work with CALCOG, League of CA Cities, and CSAC to influence implementing legislation; potential for block grant to SANDAG to leverage the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development Program 53545 (c) and 53560-53562</td>
<td>$300 M</td>
<td>To provide local assistance to cities, counties, and transit agencies and developers to develop or facilitate the development of higher density uses within close proximity to transit stations that will increase public transit ridership. Grants to cities, counties, and transit agencies for infrastructure necessary for the development of higher density uses near a transit station, or to facilitate connections between that development and the station. Loans for the development and construction of a housing development near a transit station. Loan eligibility requires at least 15 percent of the units to be made available at an affordable rent or at an affordable housing cost to persons of very low or low income for at least 55 years. Developments assisted pursuant to this subdivision shall be on parcels at least a portion of which are located within ¼ mile of a transit station. A housing development project may include a mixed-use development consisting of residential and nonresidential uses.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>HCD to develop criteria for program</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Provide comments to HCD regarding program criteria; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas and on meeting housing element goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Urban-Suburban-and Rural Parks Account 53545 (d)</td>
<td>$200 M</td>
<td>Funds shall be available upon appropriation by the Legislature for housing-related parks grants in urban, suburban, and rural areas, subject to conditions and criteria that the Legislature may provide in statute.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Implementing legislation</td>
<td>Parks in Existing/Planned Smart Growth Areas on Smart Growth Concept Map</td>
<td>Work with CALCOG, League of CA Cities, and CSAC to influence implementing legislation; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 CALCOG is the California Association of Councils of Governments; CSAC is the California State Association of Counties.
### Proposition 1C Matrix - Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 ($2.85 Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Section</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Purpose</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation Process</th>
<th>Potential San Diego Projects</th>
<th>Proposed SANDAG Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Housing Programs - 53545(a) (1) ($285 Million)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Innovation Fund 53545 (a) (1) (F)</td>
<td>$100 M</td>
<td>For competitive grants or loans to sponsoring entities that develop, own, lend, or invest in affordable housing and used to create pilot programs to demonstrate innovative, cost-saving approaches to creating and preserving affordable housing.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Implementing legislation</td>
<td>Workforce housing along the SPRINTER rail line (1-15 Interregional Partnership)</td>
<td>Work with CALCOG, League of CA Cities, and CSAC to influence implementing legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Fund 53545 (a) (1) (C)</td>
<td>$135 M</td>
<td>Grants or loans, or both, to local public entities, nonprofit corporations, and limited partnerships for construction and rehabilitation of housing for agricultural employees and their families or for the acquisition of manufactured housing. Monies may not be used for project organization or planning.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Proposition 46 criteria</td>
<td>Nonprofit and for-profit developers, local jurisdictions apply for funds through HCD NOFA</td>
<td>Provide comments to HCD, as opportunities arise, regarding program criteria; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas and on meeting housing element goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Housing and Assistance Fund for capital development</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>Funds to be distributed in the form of capital development grants and shall be administered by HCD.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Section</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Funding Purpose</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Proposed Allocation Process</td>
<td>Potential San Diego Projects</td>
<td>Proposed SANDAG Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multifamily Housing Programs - 53545 (a) (1) (A) - (B) ($590 Million)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fund for the Multifamily Housing Program 53545 (a) (1) (A)</td>
<td>$345 M</td>
<td>Low interest loans for housing developments for low income renters. (a) Under the Housing and Emergency Trust Fund Act of 2002, priority points are given to projects to prioritize any of the following: (1) Infill development. (2) Adaptive reuse in existing developed areas served with public infrastructure. (3) Projects in proximity to public transit, public schools, parks and recreational facilities, or job centers. (b) The department may utilize other factors in rural areas to promote infill development.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Proposition 46 criteria</td>
<td>Nonprofit and for-profit developers, local jurisdictions apply for funds through HCD NOFA</td>
<td>Provide comments to HCD, as opportunities arise, regarding program criteria; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas and on meeting housing element goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fund for the Multifamily Housing Program 53545 (a) (1) (A)</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>Low interest loans for housing projects which provide housing for those “at risk of becoming homeless” and homeless youth.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Housing Program 53545 (a) (1) (B)</td>
<td>$195 M</td>
<td>Low interest loans for supportive housing for individuals and households moving from emergency shelters or transitional housing or those at risk of homelessness. Priority for projects given (i) to supportive housing for people with disabilities and (ii) projects that demonstrate funding commitments from local governments for operating subsidies or services funding or both for five years or longer.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposition 1C Matrix - Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 ($2.85 Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Section</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Purpose</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation Process</th>
<th>Potential San Diego Projects</th>
<th>Proposed SANDAG Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Help Housing Fund 53545 (a) (1) (D)</td>
<td>$290 M</td>
<td>To be expended for the purposes of enabling low and very low income households to become or remain homeowners pursuant to the CalHome Program.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Proposition 46 criteria</td>
<td>Nonprofit and for-profit developers, local jurisdictions apply for funds through HCD NOFA</td>
<td>Provide comments to HCD, as opportunities arise, regarding program criteria; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas and on meeting housing element goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Help Housing Fund 53545 (a) (1) (D)</td>
<td>$10 M</td>
<td>For the construction and management under California Self-Help Housing Program.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Help Fund 53545 (a) (1) (E)</td>
<td>$200 M</td>
<td>For the California Homebuyer’s Down Payment Assistance Program, to assist first-time low and moderate income homebuyers utilizing existing mortgage financing. <em>Up to $100M of these funds may be expended to finance the acquisition of land and the construction and development of for-sale residential structures.</em></td>
<td>CalHFA</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above (CalHFA NOFA)</td>
<td>See above (Comments to CalHFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhood Fund to be used for the Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhood program 53545 (a) (1) (G)</td>
<td>$125 M</td>
<td>HCD issues a notice when funding is available to all cities, counties, or cities and counties. A city has to submit an application for the funds and, if they receive a grant from BEGIN, they shall use the proceeds for down payment assistance to a prospective first-time homebuyer who enters into an agreement to purchase a newly constructed home, or a newly erected manufactured home placed within the city, county, or city and county. Any residence assisted by BEGIN shall be continuously occupied by the homebuyer for at least five years. If the homebuyer fails to meet this condition, the loan amount shall become immediately due and payable to the local entity.</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposition 84 Matrix - The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Section</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Purpose</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation Process</th>
<th>Potential San Diego Projects</th>
<th>Proposed SANDAG Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Reduction - 75065 ($580 Million)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks in Existing/Planned Smart Growth Areas on Smart Growth Concept Map</td>
<td>Provide comments to Dept. of Parks and Recreation on program criteria; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas to meet existing deficits in current underserved communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional Parks</td>
<td>$400 M</td>
<td>Acquisition and development of new parks and expansion of overused parks that provide park and recreation access to underserved communities shall be given preference. Creation of parks in neighborhoods where none currently exist shall be given preference. Projects designed to provide efficient use of water and other natural resources.</td>
<td>Department of Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Greening Projects**</td>
<td>$90 M</td>
<td>Urban greening projects that reduce energy consumption, conserve water, improve air and water quality, and provide other community benefits. Priority given to projects that provide multiple benefits, use existing public lands, serve communities with the greatest need, and facilitate joint use of public resources and investments, including schools.</td>
<td>Implementing legislation</td>
<td>Parks and urban greening projects in Smart Growth Areas on Smart Growth Concept Map</td>
<td>Work with CALCOG, League of CA Cities, and CSAC¹ to influence implementing legislation; focus funding in Smart Growth Areas and the potential of joint use parks in school settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Grants/Incentives for regional and local land use plans</td>
<td>$90 M</td>
<td>Encourage development of regional and local land use plans that promote water conservation, reduce automobile use and fuel consumption, encourage greater infill and compact development, protect natural resources and agricultural lands, and revitalize urban and community centers.</td>
<td>Implementing legislation</td>
<td>Amending local plans to incorporate potential Smart Growth Areas and other RCP policies</td>
<td>Work with CALCOG, League of CA Cities, and CSAC to influence implementing legislation; focus funding on general plan updates and specific plans for the purpose of implementing smart growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ CALCOG is the California Association of Counties of Governments; CSAC is the California State Association of Counties.
1. Has your jurisdiction adopted a housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or self-certified?
   
   Yes ☐  No ☐

2. If your answer to Question 1 was “Yes,” please provide the date of adoption and the date of the letter of compliance from HCD, or the date of the self-certification of compliance letter submitted to HCD.

   If your answer to Question 1 was “No,” what is the anticipated date of adoption?

3. Please provide the number of new housing units that were constructed during the first year of the housing element cycle (July 1, 2005, to June 30, 2006) by income category. Units reported should have a certificate of occupancy or final inspection.
   
   a. Number of units affordable to very low income households (<50% AMI): _______
   b. Number of units affordable to low income households (50-80% AMI): _______
   c. Number of units affordable to moderate income households (80-120% AMI): _______
   d. Number of units affordable to above moderate income households (+120% AMI): _______

4. Does your housing element contain a rezoning program to meet the adequate site identification requirements of state law?
   
   Yes ☐  No ☐

5. If the answer to Question 4 was “Yes,” please provide information on the progress made toward implementing this program in accordance with the schedule contained in your housing element.
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines on the implementation of the memorandum adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 25, 2005, in association with the adoption of the 2005-2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (Attachment 1, referred to herein as the “Memorandum”). The Memorandum laid out specific provisions regarding SANDAG’s allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

These implementation guidelines restate the provisions of the Memorandum and define how they will be implemented. The numbered italicized wording in this Policy is taken verbatim from the Memorandum; the implementation guidelines are contained in the text that follows. This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated annually to determine whether changes to the guidelines are needed. Issues to be considered during the annual review include, but are not limited to: lessons learned during the prior year, the relationship between the RHNA memorandum and SANDAG’s smart growth goals, and new funding sources proposed to be subject to the memorandum.

Pilot Smart Growth Implementation Program

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

   1.1 This provision of the Memorandum has been implemented. The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program criteria, which were approved by the SANDAG Board on April 22, 2005, included the required bonus points for the cities noted above (22 points out of 147 points – 15 percent of the total points awarded).

Future Discretionary Funding Criteria

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that it is in compliance with provisions of its adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.
b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3.

c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating its progress in complying with requirements of its housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within its jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.

2.1 To implement Items 2.a. - 2.c. of the Memorandum, "discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG" shall be defined as: funds allocated by SANDAG to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process. These funds are listed in Attachment 2 and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

2.2 The following types of funding shall not be subject to the provisions of the Memorandum:

   2.2.1 Formula funds allocated by population or number of miles, because they are not allocated on a competitive basis.

   2.2.2 Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies, and SANDAG because they are not local agencies.

   2.2.3 Funds allocated directly by Caltrans to local jurisdictions because SANDAG is not involved in their allocation.

   2.2.4 Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund).

Attachment 3 provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that shall not be subject to the Memorandum.

2.3 As new funding sources become available, the Board of Directors shall decide whether they should be subject to the Memorandum and this Policy shall be amended.

2.4 To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding allocated by SANDAG to local agency projects, local jurisdictions shall do the following:

   2.4.1 During the first year of the housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006), a jurisdiction shall have submitted a draft of its housing element to HCD or have self-certified its housing element in compliance with state law by the due date for the grant application. This screening criterion shall apply for any discretionary funding programs subject to the Memorandum whose application due date is between July 1, 2005, and December 31, 2006.
2.4.2 Starting January 1, 2007, jurisdictions shall be required to have adopted housing elements (which have been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified). Also, those jurisdictions that were not able to identify adequate sites to meet their RHNA goals and were required to include a program in their housing elements to identify additional sites by rezoning must be able to demonstrate that they are making progress toward implementing the rezoning program in conformance with the schedule contained in their housing elements. “Making progress” toward implementing the rezoning program is defined as having demonstrated a good faith effort in undertaking the rezoning program described in the housing element.

2.4.3 Starting in 2006, jurisdictions shall be required to submit an annual report with the information described in Section 2.4.3.1 below in order to be eligible for funding programs for the following calendar or fiscal year, whichever is applicable. The report must be have been submitted to SANDAG prior to the application due date for the funding source. The first annual reports are due on October 1, 2006, and cover the first year of the 2005-2010 housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006). Starting in 2007, the reports will be due on April 1 per Senate Bill 253 (Torlakson), which changed the reporting time frame to the calendar year and the reporting due date to April 1 of each following year.

2.4.3.1 The annual report shall provide information regarding the actual production of housing units by all four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate). If the report is submitted for the first time in years two, three, four, or five of the housing element cycle, it shall include the total number of units produced by income category during each year of the housing element cycle. The report also shall indicate (if relevant) progress toward complying with any rezoning programs contained in the housing element that are required to meet the adequate site identification requirements of state law (as noted in paragraph 2.4.2 above).

2.5 Memorandum Item 2.b. ties the allocation of funding to the production of lower income housing through the award of incentive points based on the number of lower income housing units produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3 (Attachment 4).

2.5.1 Production of lower income housing units will be evaluated and points awarded for each application for discretionary funds based on the percentage of lower income (total very low and low combined) units that were produced in the jurisdiction. The number of lower income units will be calculated for each year on a cumulative basis, and compared to annualized RHNA Alternative 3 numbers. An example of the methodology to calculate the incentive points is shown in Attachment 5. Units shall be counted based on certificates of occupancy or final inspection. Lower income units that were acquired and rehabilitated may only count toward the RHNA Alternative 3 goals when this type of unit was used to meet the site identification requirements for the RHNA numbers as permitted in state law.

Attachments: 1. February 25, 2005, RHNA Memorandum to SANDAG Board of Directors  
2. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum  
3. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
4. Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3
5. Hypothetical Example of Allocation of Incentive Points

Adopted April 2006
February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Lori Pheiler, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer
SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant – both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.

   b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).

   c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program - Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$19.1 M</td>
<td>FY 2006 to FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.4 M</td>
<td>FY 2010 to FY 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 - Non-motorized Program</td>
<td>$2.4 M (FY 2006 allocation)</td>
<td>Annual apportionments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 M (FY 2007 allocation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle Program</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$1 M annually from 2006 to 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal^1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To be determined (TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State^1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program</td>
<td>$73 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Funding source TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $100 M in Revenue Constrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $200 M in MOBILITY 2030 Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2002 dollars

---

1 In prior funding cycles, the SANDAG Board of Directors has allocated funding to local jurisdictions through a competitive process for Regional Arterial System, Traffic Signal Optimization, Highway Noise Barrier, Regional Bikeway, and Transportation Enhancements programs. To the extent that such competitive funding programs are made available in the future, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.
### Current Funding Programs

#### Federal
- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
- Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)
- Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)
- FTA Fixed Guideway Modernization Program (Section 5309 Rail Mod)
- FTA Section 5310 Elderly & Disabled Program

#### State
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Improvement Program (RIP)
- STIP – Interregional Improvement Program (IIP)
- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)
- TDA Article 4 – General Public Transit Services (Fixed Transit Route Services)
- TDA Article 4.5 – Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)
- TDA Article 8 – Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry Services)
- TDA Planning and Administration
- State Transit Assistance (STA)

#### Local
- TransNet Highway Program
- TransNet Transit Program
- TransNet Local Streets & Roads Program

### Future Funding Programs

#### Federal – same as current programs above

#### State – same as current programs above

#### Local
1. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements
   a. Highway & transit capital projects
   b. Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) & rail transit capital improvements
2. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements & Related Programs
3. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements & Related Programs
   a. Local Street & Road Program
4. Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)
5. TransNet Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC)

---

1. There are a variety of federal and state discretionary funding programs allocated directly by Caltrans that provide funding to local jurisdictions (e.g., Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement [HBRR], Safe Routes to School, etc.). Because SANDAG does not have decision-making authority over these funding programs, they would not be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.

2. With the exception of the EMP funds, these funds (STIP-RIP, RSTP, CMAQ, TE) are being used to match the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) and other high priority regional projects. If, however, some portion of these funds were allocated by the SANDAG Board of Directors to local jurisdictions through a competitive process, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum and this policy.
## Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
### Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Modified Alternative 1**</th>
<th>Alternative 3***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Original</td>
<td>45,741</td>
<td>10,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Units to/from Unincorporated Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Units to/from Unincorporated Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Original*</td>
<td>45,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (709)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Units to/from Unincorporated Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Region</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some jurisdiction allocations by income category were adjusted slightly to ensure that regional income category percentages provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) -- 22.5 percent very low income, 17.1 percent low income, 18.9 percent moderate income, and 41.5 percent above moderate income -- were met.

**Adjusted to reflect transfer of lower income units from Unincorporated Area to City of San Diego.

**Modified Alternative 1 was approved by the SANDAG Board on February 25, 2005.

***Alternative 3 is referenced in the memorandum approved by the SANDAG Board in conjunction with the approval of the Final RHNA.

Totals may be affected by rounding.
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## Example

### Hypothetical Allocation of Incentive Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Alt.3 – Low/Very Low Income Units*</th>
<th>Annual Number Year 1</th>
<th>Number Produced Year 1**</th>
<th>Percentage of Alt. 3 Year 1**</th>
<th>Incentive Points**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Alt.3 – Low/Very Low Income Units</th>
<th>Cum. Annual Number Year 2</th>
<th>Cum. Number Produced Year 2**</th>
<th>Percentage of Alt. 3 Cum. Year 2**</th>
<th>Incentive Points Year 2**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>275%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 7.5 year number in RHNA Alternative 3 may be modified based on 5-year number included in local housing elements.

** These percentages and numbers are hypothetical for the purpose of explaining the methodology.
UPDATE ON REGIONAL HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Action Requested: INFORMATION

Introduction

Attached is the January 5, 2007, report to the Regional Planning Committee entitled Update on Regional Housing Activities.

Attachment: Regional Planning Committee Agenda Item 7 dated January 5, 2007
UPDATE ON REGIONAL HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Introduction

On October 7, 2005, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) approved the charter for the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) (formerly the Regional Housing Task Force). The charter states that this working group reports to the Regional Planning Committee. The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the RPC on the activities of the Regional Housing Working Group and SANDAG staff on housing issues during the past year.

Discussion

The RHWG and SANDAG staff members have been working on a number of projects that are intended to improve housing choice and affordability in the region. A brief discussion of these activities follows.

Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG)

Since its charter was approved by the RPC, the RHWG has met to review and discuss the Smart Growth Concept Map, the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, the I-15 Interregional Partnership housing strategy, and the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast. During 2005-06, two members of the RHWG served on the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria (TPEC) Ad Hoc Working Group, which was charged with developing criteria for prioritizing transportation projects for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan. A subcommittee of the RHWG is planning a housing forum for the spring of 2007, with the assistance of the National Conflict Resolution Center (NCRC) (formerly the San Diego Mediation Center). It is anticipated that the forum will be in the form of a mock community meeting, which will demonstrate best practices for conducting successful public meetings on housing projects.

Collaboration with Universities and Housing Advocacy Groups

SANDAG staff works with a number of housing-related groups on an ongoing basis to support the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) goal of providing a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels and abilities throughout the region. In December 2005, SANDAG co-hosted a meeting with The Campaign for Affordable Housing (TCAH), a nationwide group that facilitates and supports the development of diverse housing styles for America’s workforce and seniors by educating all segments of the public on the true nature of affordable housing and the people who reside there. SANDAG staff also spoke at several conferences during 2006 including the California Housing Consortium's April 27, 2006, policy forum (Building a Better
Commute: The Link Between Housing and Transportation), and the University of San Diego's June 8, 2006, Workforce Housing Symposium. Staff participates on several housing groups that meet regularly including the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce's Housing Committee, Civic Solutions, and the San Diego Housing Federation's Policy Committee. These collaborative efforts are primarily focused on public education and the development of strategies that will help implement the RCP's goal of improving housing choice and affordability.

Specific public outreach and educational activities on which SANDAG staff is working with these groups include the San Diego Foundation Civil Society grant to the San Diego Housing Federation (Agenda Item 7) to create a broad coalition of civic leaders with the purpose of promoting smart growth, and developing support for infrastructure and affordable housing funding mechanisms and the preparation of an educational brochure with the San Diego Housing Federation entitled Homes for All San Diegans: The State of Housing Affordability in the Region (June 2006) (Attachment 1).

State and Federal Legislation Related to Housing and Smart Growth

Each year numerous bills related to housing and smart growth are introduced in the State Legislature, many of which are the result of recommendations from statewide working groups and task forces that are addressing these issues. SANDAG staff reviews and makes comments on bills that have the potential to affect the San Diego region, and has participated over the years in several task forces and working groups that have recommended changes to state housing element law.

The approval by the voters in November of the state infrastructure bonds will provide the region with funding for affordable housing and infrastructure to support housing and smart growth in the region. Much of our focus in the upcoming legislative session will be on ensuring that our region gets its fair share of the bond funds and that such funds are allocated based on the smart growth principles contained in the RCP. Several bills will be introduced during the upcoming legislative session that will spell out the details regarding how these funds will be spent. SANDAG staff will actively monitor and provide input on this legislation.

Adoption of Board Policy No. 033: Implementation Guidelines for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Memorandum

On April 28, 2006, the SANDAG Board adopted Board Policy No. 033: Implementation Guidelines for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum. The RHNA memorandum was intended to provide incentives to jurisdictions that produce housing for low- and very low-income households and was approved in conjunction with the RHNA by the Board on February 25, 2005. The RPC recommended approval of the Draft Board Policy on February 10, 2006, to the Executive Committee and Board of Directors. The policy is being implemented as part of the 2008 Transportation Development Act (TDA)/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian call for projects that will be available in January (Agenda Item 4).

I-15 Interregional Partnership and Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Early Action Plan

The I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) and Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan both include housing components. The focus of the I-15 IRP is on workforce housing
(housing affordable to households that make between 80-120 percent of median income). A study of the financial feasibility of building this type of housing near the stations along the SPRINTER rail line is proposed to be undertaken. The information developed as a part of this study will be transferable to other areas of the region. A SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group has been established to provide input on this project, and to serve as a forum to help implement and coordinate smart growth activities in the areas around the SPRINTER stations.

The Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Early Action Plan (September 2006) provides background information on housing issues discussed at binational workshops that were held in the fall of 2005 in National City and Tijuana, and includes early actions to begin to address them. These early actions are directed at collaboration with the City of San Diego on the potential to convert industrial land to residential use, and promoting comprehensive housing developments with space for recreational activities, sports, green areas, and public facilities and services to improve the quality of life.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Monitoring Performance and Other Monitoring Activities

The Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring was accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on October 27, 2006. This report establishes a benchmark for monitoring the region’s progress toward implementing the RCP. The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the RCP housing goal (stated above in the Collaboration section) include:

1. Housing Affordability Index
2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35 percent of Income
3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units
4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category
5. Vacancy Rates
6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions
7. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

As stated in the report: The region continues to experience serious housing affordability problems. The clearest evidence of this is the affordability ranking by the California Association of Realtors (CAR) Housing Affordability Index, which indicates that only 9 percent of the county’s households can afford a median-priced home, down from 38 percent in 1995....Contributing to the increase in housing costs is the region’s lack of housing supply and variety of housing types as shown in the ratio of new jobs to housing units and the share of existing units by structure type.

During the 1999-2004 housing element cycle the number of new homes built for very low- and low-income households in the region was about 5,800 units or about 16 percent of the new housing needed as identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. (See the Regional Housing Needs Assessment discussion below.)

SANDAG will continue to monitor these indicators, as well as monitor housing element compliance, affordable housing production (both new and other types of affordable units), and share of state housing funding resources (Proposition 1C bond funds) to better understand the ability of these and other state and local resources to meet the affordable housing needs of the region.
**Next Steps**

During the upcoming year SANDAG staff and the Regional Housing Working Group will continue to work on the activities described above. We plan to participate in the work related to the San Diego Foundation grant awarded to the San Diego Housing Federation, prepare and publish a brochure with the San Diego Housing Federation, develop the initial components of a regional housing and smart growth financing strategy, prepare a report on affordable housing production in the region, and initiate work on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2010-2015 housing element cycle.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Homes for All San Diegans: The State of Housing Affordability in the Region (June 2006)

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org