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REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

>>> Please Note Meeting Time <<<

Friday, November 3, 2017
1:15 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- DRAFT 2017 REGIONAL HOUSING PROGRESS REPORT
- BRIDGING THE GAP IN HOUSING PRODUCTION AND AFFORDABILITY: “HOUSING SD” PLAN

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, and habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee (Committee) on any item at the
time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form, which is located in the rear of the
room, and then present the form to the Committee Clerk seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the
Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers
are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the committee
name and meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other
materials from the public intended for distribution at the Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no
later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become
part of the official project record, will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting, and will be posted to the
agenda file as a part of the handouts following each meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to
all agenda and meeting materials online at sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications
via our e-distribution list either at the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the
Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints, and the procedures for
filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or
complaint procedures should be directed to the SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or
john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to
discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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 or (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 at least
72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900
al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。
请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com for route information.
Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its October 6, 2017, meeting.

+2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS

+3. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: AMENDMENT REQUESTS (Tracy Ferchaw)
The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve two Smart Growth Incentive Program schedule extension amendments for the Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project and the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs Project.

+4. DRAFT 2017 REGIONAL HOUSING PROGRESS REPORT (Seth Litchney)
Staff will provide an overview of the Draft 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report, including information on the region’s progress to meet the 2010-2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan and incentive scoring for local jurisdictions under TransNet grant programs.

+5. BRIDGING THE GAP IN HOUSING PRODUCTION AND AFFORDABILITY: “HOUSING SD” PLAN (Jeff Murphy, City of San Diego)
Jeff Murphy, City of San Diego Planning Director, will discuss the “Housing SD” plan and its approach to address the shortage of affordable homes in San Diego.

6. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS
If the five-speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.
7. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, December 1, 2017, at 12 noon.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Kristine Alessio, East County, at 12:06 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland), and a second by Councilmember Carrie Downey (South County), the Regional Planning Committee approved the minutes from its September 1, 2017, meeting. Yes: Vice Chair Alessio, Councilmember Cori Schumacher (North County Coastal), Mayor Abed, and Councilmember Downey. No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: City of San Diego and County of San Diego.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CHAIR’S REPORT

3. CALIFORNIA CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION 2017 AWARD OF EXCELLENCE – SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN (INFORMATION)

The California Chapter of the American Planning Association has awarded San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan with the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Award: Large Jurisdiction of Excellence.

Action: This item was presented for information.

REPORTS

4. 2019 SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK AND PROPOSED REVENUE CONSTRAINED NETWORK SCENARIOS DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (DISCUSSION)

Phil Trom, Senior Transportation Planner, presented an overview of the proposed Unconstrained Transportation Network for the 2019 San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan) and the proposed process to develop the Revenue Constrained Network Scenarios for the 2019 Regional Plan.
Maya Rosas, Circulate San Diego, spoke in favor of the Unconstrainted Network and requested a transit friendly alternative in the Revenue Constrained scenarios.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion.

5. *TransNet* SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: DRAFT CRITERIA FOR CLIMATE ACTION PLANS AND COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES (DISCUSSION)

Carolina Ilic, Senior Regional Planner, and Allison Wood, Associate Regional Planner, presented the Cycle 4 call for projects for the *TransNet* Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program. The Regional Planning Committee discussed and provided input on the draft criteria related to Climate Action Plans and complete streets policies.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion.

6. STATE CAP-AND-TRADE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PROGRAM UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Vice Chair Alessio introduced the item.

Seth Litchney, Senior Regional Planner, provided an update on the State Cap-and-Trade Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, which provides grants and/or loans for projects that will achieve greenhouse gas emissions reductions and benefit disadvantaged communities.

**Action:** This item was presented for information.

7. PLANNING ADVISORY SERVICE REPORT ON REGIONAL PLANNING (INFORMATION)

Bob Leiter, Fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners, provided an overview of the Planning Advisory Service report: Emerging Trends in Regional Planning.

**Action:** This item was presented for information.

8. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no continued public comments.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, November 3, 2017, at 1:15 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Kristine Alessio adjourned the meeting at 1:56 p.m.
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE

### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

### OCTOBER 6, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Lorie Zapf</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Kersey</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Kristin Gaspar</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>Kristine Alessio, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colin Parent</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>David Zito</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cori Schumacher</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Mary Salas, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrie Downey</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advisory Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Fox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Garry Bonelli</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Moore</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Mona Rios</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guy McWhirter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Drucker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Karen Brindley</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Murphy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Eric LaChappa</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Beth Dreusike</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>John Donnelly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese Bradford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: AMENDMENT REQUESTS

Introduction

In July 2015, the Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project was awarded $805,000 through the SANDAG TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). In November of 2015, Grant Agreement No. 5004741 was executed with the City of Lemon Grove. To date, the project has received one amendment. The amendment was for a six-month administrative schedule extension, which was executed in January 2017 and extended the project schedule completion date to November 2017. The City of Lemon Grove has encountered various obstacles, including inclement weather, proposed changes to water main plans, and delays in utility approvals, and is requesting a 12-month schedule extension to complete the project.

In July 2015, the City of San Diego was awarded $350,000 through the SANDAG TransNet SGIP. In December of 2015, Grant Agreement No. 5004751 was executed with the City of San Diego. To date, the project has received one amendment. The amendment was for a six-month administrative schedule extension, which was executed in March 2017. The City of San Diego is currently in negotiations with various non-profit organizations to establish a maintenance agreement for the project signage. The City of San Diego is requesting a 12-month schedule extension to complete the project.

Discussion

Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project

The goal of the Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project is to realign Lemon Grove Avenue to improve the safety and accessibility of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit patrons at the Lemon Grove Avenue and Metropolitan Transit System railroad crossing. Due to unexpected issues, including heavy winter rains as well as underground utility issues, which include significant redesign of water main plans and right-of-way acquisition of other utilities such as San Diego Gas & Electric, Cox Communication, and AT&T, the project timeline has been impacted. The schedule extension amendment would allow for additional time for the redesign of the plans and creation of revised specifications, as well as for additional outreach to property owners notifying them of the right-of-way work to be performed.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve two Smart Growth Incentive Program schedule extension amendments for the Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project and the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs Project.
This is the second schedule extension amendment for this project. The first six-month schedule extension extended the project schedule completion date to November 2017 and was approved administratively per SANDAG Board Policy No. 035; Competitive Grant Program Procedures, which allows staff to process schedule extension amendments of up to six months. With this additional extension, the project would be completed within 36 months of its Notice to Proceed (NTP), which is within the completion timeline permitted for capital projects in Board Policy No. 035. The SGIP schedule amendment request (Attachment 1) details the circumstances resulting in the request for additional time to complete the project. Attachment 2 provides a revised scope of work, schedule, and budget for the project. The requested amendment is for a schedule extension only; no additional funds are requested. The City of Lemon Grove is providing a match of almost 85 percent to this project. The City of Lemon Grove anticipates that the realignment project will be completed in the fall of 2018.

At its October 11, 2017, meeting, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) recommended that the Regional Planning Committee approve the schedule amendment to extend the project completion deadline by 12 months.

San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs Project

The San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs Project includes the design and installation of wayfinding signs in the San Ysidro Port of Entry (POE) District to improve the area's mobility and respond to changes in the configuration of the POE. The project schedule has been delayed, due to the prolonged negotiations in establishing a signage maintenance agreement, which will determine the type of signage and the construction design that the City of San Diego will construct at the POE. The City of San Diego is requesting a 12-month schedule amendment to provide for additional time to resolve this issue, which has impacted the project schedule.

This is the second schedule extension amendment for this project. The first six-month schedule extension, which extended the project completion date to December 2017, was approved administratively per Board Policy No. 035, which allows staff to process schedule extension amendments of up to six months. With this additional extension, the project would be completed within 36 months of its NTP, which is within the completion timeline permitted for capital projects in Board Policy No. 035. The SGIP schedule amendment request (Attachment 3) details the circumstances resulting in the request for additional time to complete the project. Attachment 4 provides a revised scope of work, schedule, and budget for the project. The requested amendment is for a schedule extension only; no additional funds are requested. The City of San Diego anticipates that the realignment project will be completed in the December of 2018.

Due to the approaching termination of the grant agreement, the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs amendment request will be presented first to the RPC for its consideration of approval and will be presented to the ITOC on November 8, 2017, as an information item. Any comments or concerns expressed by ITOC will be provided to the RPC in the event of any future amendment requests.
Next Steps

Pending approval by the Regional Planning Committee, staff will execute the proposed SGIP schedule amendments for the Lemon Grove Realignment Project and the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs Project.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation

Attachments: 1. City of Lemon Grove’s Amendment Request Letter  
2. City of Lemon Grove’s Revised Scope of Work, Schedule, and Budget  
3. City of San Diego’s Amendment Request Letter  
4. City of San Diego’s Revised Scope, Schedule, and Budget

Key Staff Contact: Tracy Ferchaw, (619) 699-1977, tracy.ferchaw@sandag.org
September 11, 2017

Tracy Fercaw, MBA
Associate Grant Analyst
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Request for an amendment to the project schedule for the City of Lemon Grove’s
Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project

Dear Ms. Fercaw,

The City of Lemon Grove is requesting a second amendment to grant agreement number 5004741
for the Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment Project. The requested twelve-month amendment would
extend the project completion deadline from November 20, 2017 to November 20, 2018 and would
allow for additional time to complete the tasks as outlined in the grant agreement. Please accept
this letter as a request and a commitment by the City to complete the project by the extended
completion date of November 20, 2018. Below you will find supporting information to address the
three specific issues from Policy 35 of the grant program requirements to justify the amendment.

I. Previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule:

The City, in close coordination with the contracted Construction Manager, Project Manager and
Contractor, holds weekly meetings to discuss all issues related to the Realignment Project. These
meetings are held on-site and involve every key member of the project team that continue to provide
timely and accurate information to best facilitate the goal of completing the project by the anticipated
completion date.

II. A detailed explanation on the reason for delay, and how it was unavoidable:

Unfortunately, there is no single reason for the project’s delay. However, there are three main
reasons why the project is delayed—each one was unavoidable.

1. **Weather:** When the heavy rains came upon the County, the project was in a
mass grading phase, which caused significant delays with the project. First, not only
was work impacted by the individual rain events, but the impact of these events was
amplified due to the saturated nature of the site following each event that prevented
any work from occurring. The site was shut down for extended periods of time while
the existing grade dried sufficiently to be worked on. Second, the rain events caused
similar problems with export and borrow sites. Those sites were also shut down for
extended periods of time.

2. **Helix Water District:** The District requested significant changes to the original water
main plans which impacted the critical path by approximately one month while
revisions were reviewed and approved.

3. **SDG&E:** In preparation for the undergrounding phase of this project, staff has
worked with multiple entities including SDG&E, Cox Communications, AT&T, MTS,
and Caltrans. With all undergrounding projects, SDG&E is the lead entity that must complete a number of activities for each of the other utility companies so the project can move forward. This resulted a bottleneck and SDG&E delayed this project. SDG&E did not acquire right-of-way permission from all impacted properties in a timely manner and it changed the design of the undergrounding project without notifying any of the other utility companies. Once discovered, the City was in the middle of re-bidding the undergrounding project because all prior bids were greater than the funding source allowed. Additional time had to be allocated in order for the plans and specifications to be recreated as well as additional outreach to property owners notifying them of the right-of-way work that will eventually occur.

**III. Demonstrate the ability to succeed in the time frame proposed:**

As it stands today, the City anticipates that the Realignment Project will be completed and traffic will be open to the public no later than fall 2018. All known problems have been clearly identified and solved. Moving forward, the weekly project update meetings continue to provide a venue for each critical team member to share information to complete the project as the revised schedule shows.

Thank you for your consideration of this amendment request. Should you have any questions, please contact me at 619-825-3814 or mianes@lemongrove.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Mike James
Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director

Encl: Exhibit 1, Proposed Amended Project Schedule

CC: Edgar Camerino, Project Manager
LGA Realignment SGIP Grant Folder
### Project Title:
Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment

### Project Limits:
The project site is bounded on the north by Caltrans State Route 94 (SR 94). The southern and eastern edge of the project is bounded by the Downtown Village Specific Plan area. The western boundary is Olive Avenue.

### Project Summary:
The "Project" realigns and reconstructs segments of Lemon Grove (LGA) and North Avenues, trolley/railroad crossing and the LGA SR94 entrance/exit. The Project will construct the following: LGA from North Avenue to SR 94; reconstruct North Avenue between Olive Street and LGA; install new striping on Olive Street between North Avenue and Broadway; install traffic signals at the intersections of North Avenue and LGA; North Avenue and Olive Street; upgrade existing substandard improvements at the Trolley/railroad crossing; water and storm drains; and underground San Diego Gas & Electric, Cox Communications, and AT&T transmission and/or distribution overhead lines.

### Scope, Schedule, and Budget

#### Propose tasks, deliverables, a timeframe, and a budget for implementing the Project.
The project schedule must be based on "Months from Notice to Proceed (NTP)."

- Capital projects also are required to include $5,000 for baseline bicycle and pedestrian data collection.
- Also identify any seasonal constraints that may require the overall project, or specific tasks, to begin or be completed by a specific date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK NO.</th>
<th>TASK DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DELIVERABLES:</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>COMPLETION</th>
<th>DURATION:</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collect Baseline Data (REQUIRED)</td>
<td>Baseline Data Collection Plan; Raw Bike/Ped Data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Bid Documents; Contract</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>Status Reports</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project Closeout</td>
<td>Notice of Completion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 24  | **TOTAL** | 36  | **$ 5,005,000.00**

*Start and Completion dates shall be tracked using "Months from NTP"

**Seasonal Constraints, If Any:**

Identify any known seasonal constraints to project implementation

**Part III: Funding Sources**

| TOTAL PROJECT COST: | $ 5,005,000.00 |
| TOTAL GRANT AMOUNT REQUESTED FROM SANDAG: | $ 805,000.00 |
| TOTAL MATCH AMOUNT THAT WILL BE | $ 4,200,000.00 |

**SANDAG % CONTRIBUTION:**
16.1%

**MATCH % CONTRIBUTION:**
83.9%
October 17, 2017

Ms. Tracey Ferchaw  
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA  92101

Re: Request an amendment for an additional twelve (12) month extension to the project schedule for the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs.

Dear Ms. Ferchaw,

The City of San Diego is requesting an amendment to agreement No. 5004751 for the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs (Project). The requested 12 month extension will allow for the manufacturing of the wayfinding signs and construction of the placement of the signs in the right of way.

**Previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule.**  
The Project has been progressing successfully. The outreach, sign design and engineering is complete and ready to move forward. The status of these tasks have been reported in past quarterly reports. However, a maintenance agreement to maintain the signs within the right of way has not been reached with the intended third party and has delayed the fabrication of the signs and the final approval of the construction drawings. This ultimately impacts the final construction and installation of the signs.

**A detailed explanation on the reason for delay, and how it was unavoidable.**  
Since the wayfinding signs are non-standard City signs, the City’s Streets Division would be unable to maintain them. The City has been working to secure a maintenance agreement since January 2017 with a community non-profit organization to maintain the wayfinding signs once they are installed. After multiple discussions the City has not been able to secure the maintenance agreement. This has delayed the project since right-of-way permit requires the agreement and the signs cannot be fabricated without an approved permit.

**Demonstrate the ability to succeed in the timeframe proposed.**  
The City has been looking at alternative approaches to securing a maintenance agreement with other organizations or the use of standard signs in order to complete this grant and install wayfinding signs in San Ysidro.
Attached is a revised schedule showing our commitment to complete the project by December 2018. The City of San Diego respectfully requests that you approve a 12-month extension to the project schedule for the San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me at (619) 236-6368 or via email at sosborn@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,

Sara Osborn  
Senior Planner

Attachment
1. Revised Schedule of San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs.
## Capital Projects: Scope of Work, Schedule, and Budget

### Program:
SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

### Part I: Project Overview

**Project Title:** San Ysidro Wayfinding Signage  
**Project Limits:** The project area is the Port of Entry (POE) District within the San Ysidro Community Planning Area, bounded by the international border with Mexico to the south, Virginia Avenue to the west, Camino de la Plaza to the north, and East San Ysidro Boulevard to the east.

### Project Summary:
The project includes the design and installation of wayfinding signage in the San Ysidro POE District to improve the area’s mobility and respond to changes in the configuration of the POE. Signage will help visitors easily locate public services, popular destinations, and transportation options. The project will build on the current Community Plan Update with additional opportunities for focused public involvement, and it will serve as a pilot project for planned signage unifying the entire community. The City of San Diego will implement the project through an innovative public-private partnership supporting at-risk youth in the Urban Corps of San Diego County’s workforce development program.

### Part II: Scope of Work, Schedule, and Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Revised Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collect Baseline Data (REQUIRED)</td>
<td>Baseline Data Collection</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td>Month 6</td>
<td>6 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete Preliminary Planning and Community Engagement</td>
<td>Community design workshops; Design Concepts; 30% Plans</td>
<td>Month 2</td>
<td>Month 2</td>
<td>Month 10</td>
<td>8 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Complete Final Design; Project Management</td>
<td>Status Reports; 60%, 90%, and 100% Plans</td>
<td>Month 5</td>
<td>Month 5</td>
<td>Month 16</td>
<td>Month 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Obtain Environmental Clearance: Prepare Notice of Exemption</td>
<td>Notice of Exemption</td>
<td>Month 10</td>
<td>Month 22</td>
<td>Month 16</td>
<td>Month 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete Project Construction: Award Management; Project Construction</td>
<td>Contract; City permits &amp; inspections; Status Reports; As-Built; Notice of Completion</td>
<td>Month 11</td>
<td>Month 23</td>
<td>Month 24</td>
<td>Month 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Start and completion dates shall be tracked using "Months from Notice to Proceed (NTP)"*

### Seasonal Constraints, if any:
IDENTIFY ANY KNOWN SEASONAL CONSTRAINTS TO PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

### Part III: Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost:</th>
<th>$350,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Amount Requested From:</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Match Amount That Will Be:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG % Contribution:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATCH % Contribution:</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part IV: Phasing (required for select projects)

A phasing plan is required for projects that cannot be fully funded by SANDAG and/or capital grant requests over $1 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Phased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example - Change/Remove Prior to Application Submittal. Total Project Has 6 Blocks of Streetscape Improvements. Project Can Be Phased as follows:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachments
- Attachment 4
DRAFT 2017 REGIONAL HOUSING PROGRESS REPORT

Introduction

The 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report is an update to the Regional Housing Progress Report 2003-2013, and it serves two purposes. First, the report is used to calculate the points each jurisdiction would receive in accordance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 033; Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Funding Incentives, as applicants to SANDAG competitive discretionary grant programs. Second, the report provides an overview of housing permitting over the past 14 years for each jurisdiction, including the progress made on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan (RHNA) housing goals for very-low, low-, moderate-, and above-moderate units.

Discussion

Over the past year, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees have provided input on various components of the upcoming call for projects for the fourth cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP), including two new grant subprograms for climate action planning and complete streets policies. Both of these grant programs include scoring criteria focused specifically on the planning and production of affordable housing.

Board Policy No. 033

Board Policy No. 033 ties the allocation of funding through the SGIP and ATGP to each jurisdiction’s efforts to plan for and produce lower-income housing. In particular, this Board policy requires that up to 25 percent of the total points in each grant program will be given to jurisdictions meeting the following four criteria (each assigned a value of one-fourth of the total incentive points):

- Greater RHNA Share Taken
- Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced
- Total Number of Affordable Housing Units
- Percent of Lower-Income Households

The points for the Board Policy No. 033 criteria have been calculated for each individual jurisdiction for both the SGIP and ATGP and are provided in Appendices B1, B2, and B3 of the 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report. This information is provided in advance of the release of the call for projects so that jurisdictions may review and provide feedback.
**RHNA Progress**

To track the progress of housing permitting, preservation, and rehabilitation, SANDAG requested the 2016 Annual Housing Progress Reports submitted from each city and the County of San Diego to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), which were due to HCD by April 2017. The results were added to the 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report in the form of a dashboard containing each jurisdiction’s housing statistics since 2003. The dashboards are included in the 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report as Appendix C.

After collecting the data, SANDAG staff calculated the total number of housing units permitted in the region during the latest RHNA cycle (2010 to 2020). As of 2016, over the past seven years, 50,714 housing units have been permitted in the region, including 2,868 very-low-income units, 3,746 low-income units, and 2,075 moderate-income units. The totals represent 31.3 percent of the housing units goal in the latest RHNA plan; 62.5 percent of the above-moderate-income units, 6.8 percent of the moderate-income units, and 10.3 percent of the very-low- and low-income units allocated in the RHNA plan have been permitted through 2016.

The region will not have a full accounting of the percentages reached in each category until 2021, at the conclusion of the RHNA cycle. To date, the data shows most housing permitted in the region is for above-moderate-income households, while less housing for very-low, low-, and moderate-income households has been permitted.

**Regional Planning Technical Working Group Comments**

The 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report was presented as an information item at the October 12, 2017, meeting of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG). Members of the TWG commented on the need for the report to include an explanation of the role of local government in housing production, noting that economic factors, such as the down turn in the economy in 2008, play a role in determining whether RHNA goals can be met. SANDAG staff will include this language in the final version of the document.

**Next Steps**

Many local jurisdictions are taking steps and providing resources to support affordable housing development. SANDAG will compile a list of resources and programs developed by local jurisdictions to incentivize and promote more housing development. SANDAG also will continue to work with local jurisdictions to support state grant applications, provide local TransNet grant funds that reward the planning and production of affordable housing, and monitor housing development in the region.

The 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report is available for public review. The final version will be presented to the Board of Directors before the end of the year. The calls for projects for the SGIP and ATGP are scheduled to be considered for release by the Regional Planning Committee, Transportation Committee, and Board of Directors in December 2017, with grant awards anticipated to be announced in the summer of 2018.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning
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The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
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Purpose

2017 Regional Housing Progress Report

The 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report serves two purposes. First, the report is used to meet the requirements set forth in the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board Policy No. 033: Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Funding Incentives. Board Policy No. 033 provides specific provisions regarding the calculation of points for SANDAG competitive discretionary funding for local jurisdiction plans and projects. Incentives are provided in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and factors related to the planning and production of lower income housing. Section 4.2 of Board Policy No. 033 requires every local jurisdiction in the San Diego region to submit its Housing Element Annual Progress Report to be eligible for its incentive points, and requires SANDAG to prepare an annual Regional Housing Progress Report. This report provides information that will be used in evaluating applications for SANDAG funding programs that are subject to Board Policy No. 033. The housing data collected from each jurisdiction will be used in the calculation of Board Policy No. 033 incentive points for the SANDAG grant programs for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). The fourth call for projects for the program will be issued in December 2017.

Second, the report provides an overview of housing permitting and construction over the past 14 years. The information provided in this report includes the number of housing units permitted in the very-low, low, moderate, and above-moderate income categories in the San Diego region and by jurisdiction between January 1, 2003, and December 31, 2016, as well as data from the Regional Affordable Housing Inventory prepared by the San Diego Housing Federation. The report compares the number of housing units permitted in relation to 2010-2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan (RHNA) housing goals.

Background

Housing in the San Diego Region

Housing development in the San Diego region has continued its slow recovery. While the region has seen growth in permits issued for above moderate income housing units in the past several years, the region has not seen a substantial increase in the permitting or construction of housing affordable to very-low, low, and moderate income households. The lack of affordable housing development has had a detrimental effect on the ability of San Diego residents to purchase or rent a home. More than 70 percent of San Diegans cannot currently afford a median priced home, and over the last several years, rent prices have increased at a pace significantly higher than wage increases.

Locating and allocating funding for affordable housing development continues to be an issue. As shown in Figure 1, the loss of State of California Redevelopment funds and the conclusion of State Bond programs have accounted for a large portion of the loss of funding for housing construction in the San Diego region. These funding sources were a driver of affordable housing construction, and without them, affordable housing development has not recovered to at the same pace as the rest of the housing market.

1. Addressing the Housing Affordability Crisis in San Diego and Beyond, San Diego Housing Commission, November 2015
2. San Diego County Renters in Crisis: A Call for Action, California Housing Partnership and San Diego Housing Federation, May 2017
Figure 1
San Diego County Lost 69% of State and Federal Funding for Housing Production and Preservation
From FY 2008-09 to FY 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FY 2008 - 2009</th>
<th>FY 2015 - 2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Redevelopment</td>
<td>$90,581.576</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Housing Bonds and Housing Programs</td>
<td>$35,837,777</td>
<td>$17,991,618</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>$52,658,415</td>
<td>$37,160,333</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$179,077,768</td>
<td>$55,151,951</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In an effort to offset this loss, the State of California created the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program to provide grants and loans for compact, transit-oriented affordable housing development and related infrastructure that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Through two rounds of funding the State has awarded over $440 million for housing and transportation projects. Recent state legislation has attempted to identify a continuous funding source for affordable housing and provide streamlined review and permitting processes for affordable housing development.

Additionally, SANDAG grant programs support local jurisdictions’ efforts to meet the region’s affordable housing needs. Implementation of projects funded by the TransNet SGIP, in particular, are intended to help catalyze affordable housing production; provide more housing and transportation choices; create more compact, walkable, and bicycle-friendly communities that are accessible by public transportation; and help the region meet the GHG reduction targets set in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. In addition, both the SGIP and ATGP are subject to SANDAG Board Policy No. 033, which rewards the planning and production of affordable housing.

In response to the ongoing housing issues, local governments are amending their regulatory processes to encourage more affordable housing development in their cities. Streamlined approval processes, density bonus allowances, new funding opportunities, secondary unit development, and other actions are meant to allow for more housing construction and assist in improving housing options throughout the region.
SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 (Appendix A), was initially approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in April 2006 and amended in 2008, 2012, and November 2015. The policy contains four criteria used in the evaluation of applications submitted for SGIP and ATGP funding (and other competitive grant funds allocated to local jurisdictions) related to each jurisdiction’s efforts to plan for and produce lower income housing. The Board Policy No. 033 incentive points account for 25 percent of the total points available in the funding programs. The scoring criteria in Board Policy No. 033 describe in detail how the incentive points are calculated. Each criterion is assigned a value of one-fourth of the total incentive points. The four criteria are:

- **Greater RHNA Share Taken** – Jurisdictions with an assigned Lower-Income RHNA percentage higher than the regional average of lower income households shall be eligible to receive these points based on the following percentages.
  - Jurisdictions at or above 39.6 percent (the regional average) are eligible for the points in this criterion.
  - Jurisdictions below 39.6 percent are not eligible for any points in this criterion.

- **Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced** – Number of lower-income units produced over the most recent five-year period (January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016, for the current/upcoming calls for projects) as a percentage share of the regional total lower-income housing units produced.

- **Total Number of Affordable Housing Units** – The actual number of total Affordable Housing Units as a percentage of Total Housing Unit Estimates in each jurisdiction. The total affordable housing units will be taken from the most current version of the Affordable Housing Inventory as prepared by the San Diego Housing Federation based on information provided to the SDHF by the 19 jurisdictions.

- **Percent of Lower Income Households** – Percent of lower (very low and low) income households based on the 2010 Census (or most recent American Community Survey [ACS] data).

To be eligible to receive the RHNA funding incentive points for the competitive funding programs in the following calendar year, Section 4.2 of Board Policy No. 033 requires every local jurisdiction in the San Diego region to complete and submit its Housing Element Annual Progress Report to SANDAG. This report is required by state law to be submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on April 1 of each year, and contains information and data on New Housing Units Permitted in all four incomes. The jurisdiction also must have received a letter of compliance for their housing element from HCD to be considered eligible for the RHNA funding incentive points. Jurisdictions whose housing elements are incomplete or out of compliance may compete for funds subject to Board Policy No. 033, but are not eligible to receive any Board Policy No. 033 points (25 % of the total points associated with grant programs subject to Board Policy No. 033).

The housing data in this report was collected for use in the evaluation of grant applications in the fourth cycle of competitive grant funding for the TransNet SGIP and ATGP. The data will also be used to inform the Housing section of the Regional Plan Performance Monitoring Report, expected to be completed in 2018.
Requests to Local Jurisdictions for Housing Data

In May 2017, SANDAG sent requests to each of the 19 local jurisdictions in the San Diego region for the following housing data for calendar years 2014, 2015, and 2016:

- **New Building Permits Issued** - Building permits issued for new very low, low, moderate, and above-moderate income housing units. This information is found in Table B of the state Housing Element Annual Progress Report.
- **Acquisition/Rehabilitation Units** - Units acquired, rehabilitated, and deed-restricted for very low and/or low income households.
- **Preserved At-Risk Units** - Preserved units “at-risk” of conversion to market rate uses that are deed-restricted to very low and low income households.

Methodology

The 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report updates the previous Regional Housing Progress Report 2003-2013. To update the previous report, data were compiled for New Building Permits Issued and Acquisition/Rehabilitation Units for the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region between January 1, 2014, and December 31, 2016 (three calendar years). Each local jurisdiction supplied these data in their Housing Element Annual Progress Reports, along with supplemental information regarding Acquisition/Rehabilitation Units and Preserved At-Risk Units. The revised criteria in Board Policy No. 033 allows for one full unit of credit for the net increase in Acquisition/Rehabilitation Units and Preserved At-Risk Units.

The 2017 Regional Housing Progress Report includes housing data collected by SANDAG from January 1, 2003, through December 31, 2016, and provides an update on the regional progress toward the first seven years of the fifth RHNA projection period (January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2020).

Data collected by SANDAG for new building permits issued is consistent with the figures provided in the Housing Element Annual Progress Reports sent to HCD. However, data collected by SANDAG for Acquisition/Rehabilitation and Preserved At-Risk Units is only for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033 calculations for the SANDAG grant programs.

For the purposes of calculating Board Policy No. 033 incentive points, SANDAG collected the following housing data from local jurisdictions:

- **New Building Permits Issued** (deed-restricted only)
- **Acquisition/Rehabilitation Units** (deed-restricted)
- **Preserved At-Risk Units** (deed-restricted)

The housing data were then entered and used to calculate Board Policy No. 033 incentive points for the four criteria for the ATGP (using a 200 point scale) and SGIP (using a 300 point scale for capital projects and a 200 point scale for planning projects). The resulting calculations show the allocation of Board Policy No. 033 incentive points for each jurisdiction for both programs. The calculations shown in Appendix B1, B2, and B3 are weighted based on the thresholds and banding prescribed for each criterion, and assumes a 50 point scale (25% of a possible 200 points for the ATGP and SGIP planning projects) and a 75 point scale (25% of a possible 300 points for the SGIP capital projects).
The point scale used for each grant is subject to change, based on the adopted guidelines for the ATGP and SGIP. If the point scale changes, SANDAG will update this document to reflect the current point scale.

**Progress Made Towards RHNA Goals**

As shown in Table A, a total of 50,712 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2016 (seven years of the 11-year RHNA projection period [January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020] for the fifth housing element cycle), including 2,868 very-low income, 3,746 low income, 2,075 moderate income, and 42,025 above-moderate income housing units.

**Fifth Housing Element Cycle**

Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very-Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above-Moderate</th>
<th>Total for all Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Permitted</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>42,025</td>
<td>50,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal (5th Cycle)</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>30,610</td>
<td>67,220</td>
<td>161,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Produced</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>33,582</td>
<td>23,954</td>
<td>28,535</td>
<td>25,195</td>
<td>111,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region. Permitted units include deed-restricted and non-deed-restricted units as reported by each jurisdiction.

Based on the 2010 – 2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2011, the region has achieved 7.9 percent of the very-low income, 13.5 percent of the low income, 6.8 percent of the moderate income, and 62.5 percent of the above moderate income regional housing needs established for the 11-year RHNA projection period. The data collected through December 31, 2016, reflects only the first seven years (31.3%) of the 11-year RHNA cycle. The region will not have a full accounting of the percentages reached in each category until 2020 at the conclusion of the RHNA cycle. To date, although the data show satisfactory progress is being made in the above-moderate income housing category, housing for very-low, low, and moderate income households continues to trail behind.
Figures 2 and 3 chart the total number of units permitted in the region since 2003 by income level.

**Figure 2**

San Diego Region New Housing Units by Income Category

**Figure 3**

San Diego Region New Very-Low and Low Affordable Housing Units

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region. Permitted units include deed-restricted and non-deed-restricted units as reported by each jurisdiction.
Regional Housing Dashboard

A Regional Housing Dashboard was developed for each of the 19 local jurisdictions and for the San Diego region as a whole. Each Dashboard, included in Appendix C, is a snapshot compilation of all housing data collected from 2003 to 2016, covering a 14-year period.

The housing data compiled over this period spans two distinct timeframes:

- **Seven years** (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2016) of the 11-year Fifth RHNA Projection Period of the Housing Element Cycle (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020)

- **Five years** (January 1, 2012 – December 31, 2016) used for the SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 calculations for Cycle 4 of the TransNet SGP and ATGP.

Each Dashboard features the following data:

- **Housing Units Permitted**: Deed and non-deed restricted housing units permitted from 2003 to 2016 for very low, low, moderate, and above-moderate income households

- **Acquisition/Rehabilitation**: Acquisition deed restricted units for very-low and low income households from 2003 to 2016; Preserved At-Risk deed-restricted units for very-low and low income households from 2009 to 2016

- **SDHF Affordable Housing Inventory**: Summary includes total rent-restricted and total price-restricted affordable (very-low and low income) housing units with the addition of units permitted and units acquired/rehabilitated/rent restricted during calendar years 2012 through 2016

- **Final RHNA allocations and units permitted**: For the fifth RHNA projection periods

San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

The SDHF Affordable Housing Inventory determined the total number of rent or price restricted affordable housing units in each jurisdiction, both rental and for sale. The inventory is based on information provided by each of the 19 local jurisdictions in the following categories:

- **Total Rent-restricted Affordable Housing Units in jurisdiction**

- **Total Price-restricted (for sale) Affordable Housing Units in jurisdiction**

In July 2011, the SDHF sent correspondence to all local jurisdictions requesting information for affordable housing unit data. The information collected from each jurisdiction included: city, name of development, address of development, contract information, number of bedrooms, name of the developer/owner/sponsor, total units, number of restricted units, inclusionary status, funding source, and type of clientele (family, disabled, and/or senior). SDHF then obtained the following information for each jurisdiction through the SANDAG profile warehouse:

- **Median household income (HHI) (2010)**

- **Number of households below median HHI**

From this data, the SDHF determined the number of affordable housing units per 1,000 households that fell below the median household income, and compared those figures to an inventory prepared in 2009. The information SDHF Affordable Housing Inventory has been updated in this report to add new affordable units
permitted during 2012 through 2016 for very-low and low income households and units acquired/rehabilitated and rent restricted during those same years.

The SDHF affordable housing inventory summary, included as Appendix D, reflects the price and rent restricted units for each jurisdiction as of December 2011. For the purposes of calculating Board Policy No. 033 incentive points, the total affordable housing units in each jurisdiction as a percentage of total housing unit estimates was used to determine the existing concentration of lower income housing. Board Policy No. 033 provides opportunities for jurisdictions to review this data.

**Conclusion**

**Resource for the Region**

The purpose of this report is to serve as a resource for the region with respect to the number of housing units permitted in the region and in each local jurisdiction in the very-low, low, moderate, and above-moderate income categories during the past 14 (2003-2016). It also provides data from the local jurisdictions regarding the net increase in the number of existing housing units that were acquired, rehabilitated, and deed restricted for very-low and low income households, as well as the number of “at-risk” affordable housing units preserved from becoming market rate units. Additionally, the inventory provided by the SDHF in this report and updated with 2012 through 2016 data from local jurisdictions includes the total number of price and rent restricted affordable housing units by jurisdiction as of December 31, 2016.

The San Diego region is two thirds through the fifth housing element cycle, extending to the year 2020. Based on the information provided by the local jurisdictions in the region, this report shows that 8.9 percent of the RHNA goals for very-low, low, and moderate income units have been produced to date during the fifth housing element cycle.

In the first part of the past decade, state housing bond funds and redevelopment funds helped create new lower income housing units and the acquisition, rehabilitation, and rent restriction of existing housing units for lower income households. With the expenditure of state housing bond money complete, the elimination of redevelopment agencies and their housing set-aside funds, and the generally accepted need for financial subsidies and/or regulatory measures to construct very-low and low income units, the region should consider new ways to generate funding for the production of housing for families and individuals whose incomes fall into these categories. Identifying ways to increase the construction of moderate income housing should also be explored.

Many local jurisdictions are taking steps and providing resources to support affordable housing development. In future versions of this report, SANDAG will compile a list of resources and programs developed by local jurisdictions to incentivize and promote more housing development. SANDAG will continue to work with local jurisdictions to support applications to the AHSC program, provide local TransNet grant funds that reward the planning and production of affordable housing, and monitor housing development in the region.
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IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT FUNDING INCENTIVES

Purpose

Board Policy No. 033 sets forth specific provisions regarding the allocation by SANDAG of discretionary funding to local agency projects, e.g., the Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program, in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and factors related to lower income housing.

This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated annually or as necessary to determine if amendments are needed. Issues to be considered during the review include but are not limited to the relationship between the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation and achievement of SANDAG smart growth goals and new or changed funding sources.

Board Policy No. 033 was initially approved by the SANDAG Board in April 2006, following the adoption of the RHNA for the fourth housing element cycle. The policy was first amended in November 2008. The second set of amendments to Board Policy No. 033 (January 2012) was undertaken following the adoption of the RHNA for the fifth housing element cycle, which occurred on October 28, 2011.

1. “Discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG” shall be defined as: those funds allocated by SANDAG through a competitive process to local jurisdictions only (i.e., cities or the County). These funds are listed in Table 1 (Exhibit 1) and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program (formerly known as the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program).

2. The following funds are not subject to the provisions of Board Policy No. 033:

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

   2.2 Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies (Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District), or SANDAG as they are not considered local jurisdictions.

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

   2.4 Funds that can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund and the Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program).
Table 2 (Exhibit 2) provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that are not subject to Board Policy No. 033.

3. As new funding sources become available, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) shall review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors if these new funding sources should be subject to Board Policy No. 033.

4. To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding (see examples in Table 1) allocated by SANDAG to local jurisdiction projects, local jurisdictions shall meet the following thresholds:

   4.1 Housing Element Compliance: In order to qualify for points under Board Policy No. 033, a jurisdiction must have an adopted Housing Element found to be in compliance by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or its equivalent at the time of the funding program’s application deadline. No Board Policy No. 033 points will be awarded to projects in jurisdictions that have not received a letter of compliance from HCD prior to the funding program’s application deadline. A court-upheld Housing Element qualifies a jurisdiction to receive Board Policy No. 033 points.

   4.2 Annual Housing Element Progress Reports: Jurisdictions shall be required to submit an annual report with the information described below in order to be eligible for funding programs for the following calendar year. This annual report shall include the same information that HCD requests in the Annual Housing Element Progress reports required by housing element law, as well as the information described below, and shall be submitted to SANDAG by the deadline in state law, which is April 1 of each year. SANDAG will prepare a report with this information for review by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Regional Planning Committee each year. Funding applications subject to this Policy shall be evaluated based on the annual report for the preceding year that was submitted to SANDAG and HCD.

   4.3 The annual report shall provide information regarding the number of building permits issued for new residential construction by income category (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) using the forms provided by HCD for its Annual Housing Element Progress Report. 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 building permits issued for new residential construction by income category during each year of the housing element cycle (including the two and a half years preceding the housing element due date). The annual report also shall indicate how many acquired/rehabilitated/deed restricted units were permitted and how many “at risk” units were preserved during each year.

5. Board Policy No. 033 ties the allocation of funding to four criteria related to each local jurisdiction’s efforts to plan for and produce lower income housing through the award of incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100, or 25 percent of the total points in a funding program). Each criterion is assigned a value of one-fourth of the total points. The four criteria are: (1) Greater RHNA Share Taken, (2) Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower Income Units Produced, (3) Total Number of Affordable Housing Units, and (4) Percent of Lower Income Households.
5.1 The Scoring Criteria in Exhibit 3 describes in detail how the incentive points are calculated for each of the four criteria.

Exhibits: 1. Table 1, Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board Policy No. 033 (Local Jurisdiction Projects)
   2. Table 2, Funding Programs Not Subject to Board Policy No. 033
   3. Scoring Criteria Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

Adopted April 2006
Amended November 2008
Amended January 2012
Amended November 2015
### TABLE 1
**DISCRETIONARY FUNDING PROGRAMS**  
SUBJECT TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033  
(LOCAL JURISDICTION PROJECTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Programs</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3- Non-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorized Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety</td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Funding source TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2002 dollars
## TABLE 2
### FUNDING PROGRAMS NOT SUBJECT TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033

| 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  
| • FTA New Freedom Program  
| • FTA Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) 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 Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program  
| • TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements  
| o Highway & transit capital projects  
| o Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) & rail transit capital improvements  
| • TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements & Related Programs  
| • TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements & Related Programs  
| o Local Street & Road Program  
| • Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)  
| • 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 Policy No. 033.

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 Board Policy No. 033.
Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

The following four criteria, weighted equally, will be used to calculate the incentive points (25 percent of the total points) for each program subject to Board Policy No. 033.

1. Greater RHNA Share Taken: Jurisdictions with an assigned Lower Income RHNA percentage that is higher than the regional average of lower income households shall eligible to receive these points using the following percentages.
   - Jurisdictions at or above 39.6 percent (the regional average) shall be eligible for the total number of points for this criterion
   - Jurisdictions below 39.6 percent shall not be eligible for any points for this criterion

2. Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income* Units Produced: Jurisdictions shall be eligible to receive up to one-fourth of the total Board Policy No. 033 points awarded based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total number of lower-income units produced in the region over the most recent five years using the following percentages:
   - 0 percent share or no units produced (0 points)
   - >0 – 5 percent (1/3 of the points)
   - >5 – 10 percent (2/3 of the points)
   - greater than 10 percent (the total number of points available for this criterion)

Units that are acquired/rehabilitated and deed restricted at affordable levels for lower income households or “at risk” units that are preserved for a period of 30 years or longer shall be included for the purposes of the above calculation at full credit (i.e., one unit each).

*Units will be counted that are deed restricted to lower income households at affordable prices as defined in the instructions for the HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Report. This number will be taken from the “Deed Restricted” rows in HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Report Table B.

3. Total Number of Affordable Housing Units: This criterion will be based on the actual number of Lower Income Housing Units** in a jurisdiction as a percentage of the total number of housing units in a jurisdiction. Jurisdictions shall be eligible to receive up to one-fourth of the total Board Policy No. 033 points for this criterion using the following percentages:
   - >0 – 3 percent (1/4 of the points)
   - >3 – 6 percent (1/2 of the points)
• >6 – 10 percent (3/4 of the points)
• Greater than 10 percent (the total number of points available for this criterion)

**This number will be taken from the most current version of the Affordable Housing Inventory as updated by the San Diego Housing Federation, and it will be provided to each local jurisdiction to review for accuracy.

4. Percent of Lower-Income Households: Jurisdictions shall be eligible to receive up to one-fourth of the total Board Policy No. 033 points for this criterion based on the percent of lower-income households residing in each jurisdiction (based on the most recent American Community Survey data) using the following percentages:

• 0 – 40 percent lower-income households (1/3 of the points)
• >40 – 50 percent lower-income households (2/3 of the points)
• >50 percent lower income households (the total number of points available for this criterion)
### SANDBAG Board Policy No. 033 Calculation
#### Award of Incentive Points for the TDA/TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program
(Capital and Non-Capital) - 50 points out of 200

**July 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Housing Element Compliance</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Assigned Lower Income RHNA Percentage</th>
<th>Greater RHNA Share Taken Y/N?</th>
<th>Regional Share of Cumulative Lower Income Units Produced</th>
<th>Existing Concentration of Lower Income Housing</th>
<th>2015 American Community Survey Percent of Very Low and Low Income Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Lower Income Units Produced 1/1/12-12/31/16 (Five years)</td>
<td>Share of Regional Total Lower Income Housing Units</td>
<td>% Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Points</td>
<td>% Points</td>
<td>% Points</td>
<td>% Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>46,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>82,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>9,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>35,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>25,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>48,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>9,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>29,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>8,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>16,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>66,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>16,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>24,172</td>
<td>528,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>30,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>20,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>31,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Uninc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>173,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,017</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>45,774</td>
<td>1,185,498</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurisdictions with scores in strike-through are ineligible for Board Policy No. 033 points because their Housing Elements are not in compliance.

1 The numbers in Column 2A include newly permitted lower income deed-restricted units, lower income deed-restricted units acquired/rehabilitated, and "at-risk" units preserved between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2016 (5 years). This data was based on currently available data obtained from local jurisdiction Annual Housing Element Progress Reports (due April 1 each year) or by contacting local jurisdiction staff. Per the revised Board Policy No. 033, full credit is awarded for deed-restricted acq/rehab units and "at-risk" units preserved.

2 This number is based on the most current rent and price restricted affordable housing inventory prepared by the San Diego Housing Federation (SDHF) based on information provided to the SDHF by the 19 jurisdictions. This information may be reviewed for accuracy by each jurisdiction.

3 Total Housing Unit estimates for 2016 (Current SANDAG Estimates).
### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 Calculation

**Award of Incentive Points for the TDA/TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program**

**Capital - 75 points out of 300**

**July 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Housing Element Compliance</th>
<th>Greater RHNA Share Taken</th>
<th>Regional Share of Cumulative Lower Income Units Produced</th>
<th>Existing Concentration of Lower Income Housing</th>
<th>2015 American Community Survey Percent of Very Low and Low Income Households</th>
<th>Point Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N?</td>
<td>Assigned Lower Income RHNA Percentage</td>
<td>Points Given for Taking Higher Share</td>
<td>Number of Lower Income Units Produced 1/1/12-12/31/16 (Five years)</td>
<td>Share of Regional Total Lower Income Housing Units</td>
<td>Total Lower Income Housing Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Uninc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>7,017</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>45,774</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurisdictions with scores in strike-through are ineligible for Board Policy No. 033 points because their Housing Elements are not in compliance.

1. The numbers in Column 2A include newly permitted lower income deed-restricted units, lower income deed-restricted units acquired/rehabilitated, and “at-risk” units preserved between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2016 (5 years). This data was based on currently available data obtained from local jurisdiction Annual Housing Element Progress Reports (due April 1 each year) or by contacting local jurisdiction staff. Per the revised Board Policy No. 033, full credit is awarded for deed-restricted acq/rehab units and “at-risk” units preserved.

2. This number is based on the most current rent and price restricted affordable housing inventory prepared by the San Diego Housing Federation (SDHF) based on information provided to the SDHF by the 19 jurisdictions. This information may be reviewed for accuracy by each jurisdiction.

3. Total Housing Unit estimates for 2016 (Current SANDAG Estimates).
## SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 Calculation
### Award of Incentive Points for the TransNet Smart Growth Program
#### Planning - 50 points out of 200
##### July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Housing Element Compliance</th>
<th>Assigned Lower Income KHNA Percentage</th>
<th>Greater RHNA Share Taken</th>
<th>Regional Share of Cumulative Lower Income Units¹</th>
<th>Existing Concentration of Lower Income Housing</th>
<th>2015 American Community Survey Percent of Very Low and Low Income Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>24,172</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Uninc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>7,017</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>45,774</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The numbers in Column 2A include newly permitted lower income deed-restricted units, lower income deed-restricted units acquired/rehabilitated, and "at-risk" units preserved between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2016 (5 years). This data was based on currently available data obtained from local jurisdiction Annual Housing Element Progress Reports (due April 1 each year) or by contacting local jurisdiction staff. Per the revised Board Policy No. 033, full credit is awarded for deed-restricted acq/rehab units and "at-risk" units preserved.

2. This number is based on the most current rent and price restricted affordable housing inventory prepared by the San Diego Housing Federation (SDHF) based on information provided to the SDHF by the 19 jurisdictions. This information may be reviewed for accuracy by each jurisdiction.

3. Total Housing Unit estimates for 2016 (Current SANDAG Estimates).
### SANDAG Board Policy No. 33
#### Five Year Housing Permitting Total
##### 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>New Units (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acquisition/Rehab (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk (Deed-restricted)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data will be used for the purposes of awarding Board Policy No. 033 points in the FY 2017 Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program Call for Projects anticipated in 2017.
### Percent of Low and Very-Low Income Households Based on the 2015 American Community Survey (2015 ACS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Low/Very-Low Income Households</th>
<th>Percent of Low/Very-Low Income Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>42,791</td>
<td>12,516</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>78,006</td>
<td>31,495</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>32,564</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>23,465</td>
<td>6,526</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>45,041</td>
<td>22,656</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>9,014</td>
<td>4,918</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>23,785</td>
<td>10,926</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>15,332</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>60,493</td>
<td>26,419</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>15,832</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>485,091</td>
<td>191,948</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>28,738</td>
<td>12,716</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>19,364</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>30,451</td>
<td>15,393</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Univ.</td>
<td>159,359</td>
<td>61,880</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Households making 80% less than the ACS Median Household Income are considered either a “Low” or “Very-Low” Income Household based on the Department of Housing and Community Development income maximum for low income households.

2. Since 80% of the ACS Median Household Income for San Diego County is $51,447, only a portion of the households identified in the $50,000 to $59,999 ACS Median Household Income range meet the definition of “Low” Income households. To capture this portion, SANDAG must assume the number households earning between $50,000 and $51,447 for each jurisdiction. $1,447 ($51,447 - $50,000) represents 14.5% ($1,447/$9,999) of the $50,000 to $59,999 income range. Therefore, 14.5% of households within the $50,000 to $59,999 ACS Median Household Income range are assumed to be “Low” income households.

Sources:
### New Units Permitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

**5th Cycle (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>4,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

**Total Rent Restricted Units**
- 1,671
**Total Price Restricted Units**
- 383
**New Housing Units**
- 185
**Total Affordable Housing Units**
- 2,239

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

**5 Years (1/1/012 - 12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted</th>
<th>Existing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Deed-Restricted)</td>
<td>Acq/Rehab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGIONAL HOUSING DASHBOARD
### 2003 - 2016
#### CHULA VISTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VERY LOW Deed Restricted</th>
<th>VERY LOW Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>VERY LOW TOTAL</th>
<th>LOW Deed Restricted</th>
<th>LOW Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>LOW TOTAL</th>
<th>MODERATE Deed Restricted</th>
<th>MODERATE Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>MODERATE TOTAL</th>
<th>ABOVE MODERATE TOTAL</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>14,469</td>
<td>16,382</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>4,956</td>
<td>12,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2 Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

- **Total Rent Restricted Units**: 2,699
- **Total Price Restricted Units**: 102
- **New Housing Units**: 634
- **Total Affordable Housing Units**: 3,435

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033
#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low ) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.
# Regional Housing Dashboard

## 2003 - 2016

### Coronado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>ABOVE Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>ABOVE Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Affordable Housing Units

1. Total Rent Restricted Units = 177
2. Total Price Restricted Units = 12
3. New Housing Units (Very Low & Low) = 0
4. Total Affordable Housing Units = 189

---

**Additional Notes:**

- Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033.
- Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
- San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.
- New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.
## REGIONAL HOUSING DASHBOARD
### 2003 - 2016
#### DEL MAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.
4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

- Total Rent Restricted Units: 0
- Total Price Restricted Units: 0
- New Housing Units: 0
- Total Affordable Housing Units: 0

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2017 REGIONAL HOUSING PROGRESS REPORT
## Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>5,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

- Total Rent Restricted Units: 895
- Total Price Restricted Units: 312
- New Housing Units: 79

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### EL CAJON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>Total Price Restricted Units</th>
<th>New Housing Units</th>
<th>Total Affordable Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.
4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low ) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016
## REGIONAL HOUSING DASHBOARD

### 2003 - 2016

#### ENCINITAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Low Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Very Low Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Very Low TOTAL</th>
<th>Low Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Low Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Low TOTAL</th>
<th>Moderate Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Moderate Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Moderate TOTAL</th>
<th>ABOVE MODERATE TOTAL</th>
<th>VERY LOW TOTAL</th>
<th>LOW TOTAL</th>
<th>VERY LOW Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low ) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Price Restricted Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units*</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

4 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low ) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted 2</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory 3

| Total Rent Restricted Units | 1,367 |
| Total Price Restricted Units | 118 |
| New Housing Units 4 | 206 |
| Total Affordable Housing Units | 1,691 |

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Existing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low ) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>Total Price Restricted Units</th>
<th>New Housing Units&lt;br&gt;4</th>
<th>Total Affordable Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12- 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Low</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Moderate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.
4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.
## Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

## San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>564</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Price Restricted Units</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Acq/Rehab</td>
<td>Preserved At-Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGIONAL HOUSING DASHBOARD
### 2003 - 2016
#### LEMON GROVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq/Rehab</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.
4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>Total Price Restricted Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix C10
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>1,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2 Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

3 San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

4 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

- **Total Rent Restricted Units**: 2,317
- **Total Price Restricted Units**: 6
- **New Housing Units**: 109
- **Total Affordable Housing Units**: 2,432

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033.
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>1,474</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Price Restricted Units</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

**5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

3 San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2 Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

4 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

**5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10 - 12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted2</td>
<td>21,977</td>
<td>16,703</td>
<td>15,462</td>
<td>33,954</td>
<td>88,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,321</td>
<td>28,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2 Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

3 San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

4 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low ) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>Total Price Restricted Units</th>
<th>New Housing Units4</th>
<th>Total Affordable Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,843</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>24,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

**5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved</th>
<th>At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Deed-Restricted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>4,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units Permitted</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>4,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>2,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rhna Allocation

- Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033.
- Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>2,932</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Price Restricted Units</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>3,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016.
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>3,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2 Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

3 San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

4 New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Price Restricted Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2003 - 2016 SANTEE

### Very Low-Low-Moderate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Units</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Price Restricted Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units⁴</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Existing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq/Rehab</td>
<td>Preserved At-Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033
2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.
3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.
4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016
### New Units Permitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

- **Total Rent Restricted Units**: 453
- **Total Price Restricted Units**: 7
- **New Housing Units**\(^4\): 180
- **Total Affordable Housing Units**: 640

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

\(^2\) Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

\(^3\) San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

\(^4\) New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016
# Regional Housing Dashboard (2003 - 2016)

## Unincorporated County of San Diego

### New Units Permitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Non Deed Restricted</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ABOVE Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>15,034</td>
<td>17,183</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### 5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

- **Total Rent Restricted Units**: 1,756
- **Total Price Restricted Units**: 0
- **New Housing Units**: 21
- **Total Affordable Housing Units**: 1,777

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

#### 5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

**5th RHNA (7 Years, 1/1/10-12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>30,610</td>
<td>67,220</td>
<td>161,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data for Preserved At-Risk units collected from January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2016 for the purposes of Board Policy No. 033

2. Units Permitted are based on 7 years (1/1/2010 - 12/31/2016) of the 11-year RHNA Projection Period for the fifth housing element cycle.

3. San Diego Housing Federation inventory includes total deed restricted affordable (very low and low income) units collected from each jurisdiction in December 2011.

4. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 - 2016

### San Diego Housing Federation Affordable Housing Inventory

| Total Rent Restricted Units | 37,140 |
| Total Price Restricted Units | 2,444 |
| New Housing Units | 6,190 |
| Total Affordable Housing Units | 45,774 |

### SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

**5 Years (1/1/12 - 12/31/16)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units Permitted (Deed-Restricted)</th>
<th>Acq/Rehab</th>
<th>Preserved At-Risk</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## San Diego Housing Federation (SDHF)
### Affordable Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction:</th>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction:</th>
<th>Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction:</th>
<th>New Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D
San Diego Housing Federation (SDHF)
Affordable Housing Inventory

La Mesa
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 570
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 564
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 6
New Housing Units 0

Lemon Grove
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 384
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 303
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 0
New Housing Units 81

National City
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 2,432
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 2,317
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 6
New Housing Units 109

Oceanside
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 1,637
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 1,474
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 21
New Housing Units 142

Poway
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 864
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 719
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 41
New Housing Units 104

City of San Diego
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 24,172
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 18,843
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 1,243
New Housing Units 4,086

San Marcos
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 3,368
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 2,932
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 193
New Housing Units 243

Santee
Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction: 689
Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction: 643
Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction: 0
New Housing Units 46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Affordable Housing Units in Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Rent Restricted Affordable Units in Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Price Restricted Units in Jurisdiction</th>
<th>New Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solana Beach</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vista</strong></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of San Diego (Unincorporated)</strong></td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for all Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>45,774</td>
<td>37,140</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>6,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. New Housing Units includes deed restricted affordable (very low and low) units as well as Acq/Rehab (very low and low) units collected from each jurisdiction for 2012 through 2016.
BRIDGING THE GAP IN HOUSING PRODUCTION AND AFFORDABILITY: “HOUSING SD” PLAN

Introduction

On June 21, 2017, City of San Diego Mayor Faulconer unveiled the “Housing SD” Plan to increase housing supply, lower costs, and promote transit-oriented development to address the lack of housing affordability for low- and middle-income San Diegans.

City of San Diego Planning Director, and Vice Chair of the SANDAG Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Jeff Murphy, will discuss the Plan's approach to address the shortage of affordable homes in San Diego and support the City's Climate Action Plan.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. “Housing SD” Plan Fact Sheet

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, keith.greer@sandag.org
Mayor Kevin L. Faulconer’s ‘Housing SD’ Plan

BUILDING OUR BETTER FUTURE STARTS HERE

Over the past decade, new housing development has not kept pace with job or population growth, resulting in housing costs that have increased at a much faster rate than income levels. With a growing population and a county median home price well over $500,000, more and more families are finding it increasingly difficult to find an affordable place to live in San Diego. Additionally, many economic analysts have reported that the single greatest threat to our region’s economy is the high cost of local housing.

Since taking office, it has been a priority of this administration to improve the government functions that directly impact new development. A major focus has been placed on the performance and operations within the Development Services Department (DSD) and over the past several years, many positive changes and new policies have been implemented to improve these functions. Some of these changes include streamlined processing of certain permits through self-certification programs, simplification of fee structures by reducing the total number of fees and converting over 60 deposit accounts to flat fees, improved customer service training and additional operating hours on certain nights and weekends, as well as implementing new technologies like OpenDSD and the soon to be online Accela which will improve information and data sharing.

The City’s Planning Department also has an impact on new development. Community plan updates are critical to providing a clear framework for new projects to follow. Currently, the majority of the City’s community plans are woefully outdated, adding major uncertainty to new housing projects looking to comply with City code. A renewed effort is already underway to update these plans. Since 2014, nine community plans have been updated1 and six more are currently being worked on. In the prior ten years only the Downtown Community Plan was updated. The Mayor has also made a commitment to speed up how long it takes to complete community plan updates and set a three year timeline for the process. In the past, some plans have taken as long as nine years to complete updates.

These changes will help bring about positive momentum in the number of new housing units that San Diego is developing but they are not enough on their own. More action is necessary to help San Diego get out of its housing crisis and improve housing affordability for its citizens. This housing plan and the policies outlined below will provide new tools for developing additional housing. It is critical that these policies be implemented if San Diego is to overcome this hurdle and help provide the new housing it so desperately needs.

1 Otay Mesa ’14; Ocean Beach ’14; Navajo ’15; Southeastern ’15; Encanto ’15; North Park ’16; Uptown ’16; Golden Hill ’16; San Ysidro ’16.
The following summarizes the Mayor’s Housing SD Plan that outlines several goals and strategies to be developed over the next year to help increase housing production in the City.

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY - APPROACH**

*Improve Housing Affordability*
Housing in the San Diego region has become extremely unaffordable. More than 70% of San Diegans cannot afford a median priced home. San Diegans are spending a significant percentage of their paychecks on housing costs making this one of the most unaffordable markets in the nation. We must improve housing affordability in our region so that people can afford to live here.

*Improve Review Process*
Evidence has shown that the cost of delivering new housing units can be greatly impacted by government processes. Uncertain timelines, burdensome regulations, and exhaustive discretionary review make it harder to quickly and inexpensively develop new housing stock. We must streamline our development standards and create certainty in the process.

*Facilitate More Affordable Housing*
Developing more affordable housing units is critical to protecting our most vulnerable populations and making sure that low income San Diegans have adequate housing. The loss of redevelopment funds has left a void in funding for affordable housing -- $187 million and counting since the state ended redevelopment in 2012. We must identify ways to provide more funding for affordable housing.

*Support Climate Action Plan*
Increasing our housing supply is critical to addressing this crisis. Just as important though is focusing on where we direct that growth. Increasing housing unit production in our Transportation Priority Areas will help San Diego meet the targets in the Climate Action Plan (CAP) for increasing transit, bicycle, and pedestrian commuting.

**REGULATORY RELIEF STRATEGIES**

*Middle Income Density Bonus Program*

**Winter 2019**

In the City of San Diego, there is an inadequate supply of entry level housing units that are affordable for individuals making a middle-class income. The vast majority of new housing units produced are priced at the top of the market. The lack of an adequate supply of housing at all levels drives up the rents and costs of ownership of all levels of housing, which has a detrimental effect upon the residents of the City of San Diego. The absence of an adequate supply of housing for those households earning very low, low, moderate, and middle incomes causes a disproportionate hardship on those households.

It is in the public interest that a range of housing opportunities be provided for a broad spectrum of persons, but specifically including those of low income and also including those earning middle incomes. While the City has programs that promote the development of low income housing\(^2\) (i.e., households making \(\leq 60\%\) AMI), few tools are

---

\(^2\) Affordable Density Bonus Ordinance, Inclusionary Affordable Housing Ordinance, Affordable/In-Fill & Sustainable Development Program
available that focus on providing housing options for families making middle incomes (i.e., households making ≤150% AMI).

In response, the City is proposing a Middle Income Density Bonus Program, which provides incentives for developers to construct housing projects that provide units that can be sold or rented to entry-level/middle-income households. The creation of additional middle income housing would allow for the development of housing for persons who are school teachers, nurses, police, first responders, and firefighters, among others.

**Draft Program Highlights**

The details of the program are still in development and require input from stakeholders familiar with the housing market. Further, the intent of this program is not to compete with other effective housing tools (i.e., Affordable Density Bonus Ordinance), but to create another available option that will further increase housing supply and improve affordability. The proposed program can be generally described as follows:

- Applicable to rental or for-sale units/residential or mixed-use development
- Qualifying projects may receive up to a 25% density bonus above the base density
- Allows for more ministerial processing through the use of incentives/waivers
- 10% of the units must be reserved for families making ≤150% AMI
- Units must be reserved for a period of no less than 15 years
- Projects must be located within the City's Transit Priority Areas
- Projects must comply with inclusionary housing ordinance (pay in-lieu fee)

**Affordable/Sustainable Expedite Program**

**Summer 2017**

In the early 1980s, the City Council first approved a program to assist the permitting of affordable housing units in the shortest processing time possible and to reduce development costs to the greatest extent. In 2003, the program was expanded and renamed to its current title Affordable/In-Fill & Sustainable Development Program, which is commonly referred to as The Expedite Program. The purpose of the program is to offer flexibility in the application of development regulations, as well as make available expedited permit review for projects providing affordable and sustainable shelter.

The program is being revised to incorporate new City initiatives, address prior Council direction and improve service delivery where qualifying projects can have their discretionary and ministerial permits expedited. [Expedited Discretionary Review](#)

Currently, the LDC (§143.0915 & §143.0920) identifies certain affordable and sustainable development project types that are allowed to deviate from certain development standards with a Process Four Site Development Permit (SDP). In an effort to encourage the use of this tool, staff is proposing to expand the eligibility of the program to include the following affordable and sustainable residential or residential mixed use development project types.

- Projects where at least 10% of the units are reserved for low/very low income families; or,
Projects located in the San Diego Promise Zone; or,
Projects located in the City's Transit Priority Area; or,
Projects that propose a higher density that is authorized in a community plan; or,
Projects that incorporate voluntary Tier 2 sustainable development standards pursuant to CAL Green Building Code

Eligible projects that fit into one of the categories above then qualify for the following permit expedite benefits.

- Deviations from development standards may be processed with a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) Process Two.
- Additional deviations, including Environmentally Sensitive Lands, can be processed with an NDP Process Two.
- Projects within the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone can be processed with an NDP Process Two.

Companion (Second Dwelling) Unit Production
Summer 2017

As reported by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) offer benefits that address common development barriers such as affordability. ADUs are an affordable type of home to construct because they do not require paying for land, major new infrastructure or structured parking, which is significantly less costly than homes in new multifamily infill buildings.

To encourage more production of ADUs, the State passed three bills (SB 1069, AB 2299 and AB 2406) that will provide homeowners the opportunity to add an ADU on their residential property with reduced requirements to parking, fees and permits. In order to maximize and integrate the housing needs within the City of San Diego, we are developing code changes to not only implement state mandates, but include changes that further improve regulations to help promote the construction of ADUs. Some of the incentives being considered are as follows:

- Remove requirement that recorded owner reside on premises
- Remove specialized height restrictions and use base zone height limits
- Increase unit size from 700 sf to 50% of the primary or 1,200 sf, whichever is less (SB1069)
- Reduce setback requirements
- Reduce parking requirements and standards

---

3 A swath of San Diego has been federally designated as a San Diego Promise Zone (SDPZ) that will prioritizes San Diego's position to receive federal grants to address key areas to the City's most disadvantaged neighborhoods. The targeted area stretches from East Village and Barrio Logan in the West extending to Encanto and Emerald Hills in the East. [https://www.sandiego.gov/economic-development/sdpromisezone](https://www.sandiego.gov/economic-development/sdpromisezone)
Density bonus is a California state law (Government Code section 65915-65918) that allows a developer to increase density above the maximum set under a city's local land use plan (Community Plan) when a certain percentage of the new homes are reserved for very low, low or moderate income households or for seniors. In addition, developers of qualifying residential projects are entitled to receive certain benefits, including reduced parking standards, “incentives or concessions,” and waivers of certain development standards. State law requires that each jurisdiction adopt an ordinance specifying how compliance with the State law will be implemented.

On January 1, 2017, four laws (AB2501, AB2556, AB 2442 and AB 2501) went into effect that amended the State’s mandatory density program, which requires that the City update its current regulations. In addition, code modifications are being considered in an effort to further incentivize the use of this housing tool to increase the production of more affordable units. Some of the more noteworthy changes include the following.

- All density calculations (base and density bonus) must be rounded up to next whole number
- Developers are eligible for an incentive even if they do not request a density bonus
- Projects reserving 10% of the total units for very-low income, transition-age foster youth, disabled veterans, or persons experiencing homelessness are eligible for a 20% density bonus

The City Council adopted a comprehensive update to the Land Development Code (LDC) on December 9, 1997. This update also directed the City Manager to develop a code monitoring and update process in order to address new issues and unforeseen challenges not anticipated as part of the comprehensive update. The establishment of this process recognized the importance of code revisions that removed unnecessary barriers in an effort to simplify and streamline permitting processes. Through these regular updates, the LDC will be more responsive to address the City's land use issues. Significant proposed amendments to streamline the process and incentivize development are highlighted below:

- Site Development Permit no longer required for multiple dwelling unit development on lots that have been consolidated
- Expand the residential area of Live/Work Quarters and allow the use in additional zones
- Amend grading regulations pertaining to monitoring of paleontological resources
- Exempt designated historic structures from gross floor area calculations and parking standards, when the historic structure is incorporated into the project design
- Reduce parking for special needs housing
Streamlined Environmental Review
Winter 2018

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for public and private development projects that are consistent with the densities established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified. The City of San Diego has certified EIRs for several recently adopted community plan updates (CPU). Projects that are consistent with the densities and use characteristics considered by those CPU Program EIRs may qualify for the CEQA streamlining under 15183.

CEQA Section 15183 requires an evaluation of direct project impacts in the same manner as the Negative Declaration (ND) and EIR process. However, unlike a ND or an EIR, projects which rely on the CEQA Streamlining 15183 process may benefit from the cumulative analysis contained within a CPU Program EIR and the application of the predefined mitigation and avoidance measures outlined in the CPU Program EIR. Projects qualifying for the CEQA Streamlining 15183 process can generally be completed in significantly less time and at a reduced cost compared with the typical (non-streamlined) ND and EIR processes.

To simplify use and ensure consistency in application, the City will be developing a Section 15183 checklist and guidance document.

Development Impact Fee (DIF) Calculations
Spring 2018

For several years, the City has applied Development Impact Fees (DIF) on new development in order to offset future costs derived from new residents and employees that will require public facilities such as fire stations, libraries, parks, roads, and other public improvements. However, concerns and questions have been raised over the methodology used to calculate the fee. For example, a flat residential rate is applied to each new residential unit, irrespective of unit size. As such, smaller and more affordable units pay disproportionately more in DIF than a larger unit.

In response, the City will be reviewing the existing methodologies and procedures, survey best impact fee practices, recommend a preferred methodology for calculation of fees for consideration.

Parks Master Plan
Fall 2019

A Parks Master Plan (PMP) helps articulate a clear vision (a “road map”) for the City's parks, recreation facilities and open space program. A plan would focus on immediate, short-term, and longer-term capital development and improvement strategies that correspond to a community’s unmet needs and priority investments for critical parks and recreation services. It is envisioned that the plan would:

- Address needs in the current system and emerging trends for the future
- Propose an equitable citywide distribution of park and recreation facilities
- Evaluate how the City currently determines park needs
• Develop policies on ‘park equivalencies’ for park deficient communities
• Identify high priority sites for park land acquisition, design and development;
• Identify best practices for the classification and provision of parks
• Develop an implementation plan for prioritizing, phasing and funding

Transit Priority Area Parking Standards  
Winter 2018

The availability of parking and housing affordability are two of the most frustrating problems large cities face. Parking spaces add significantly to the cost of building houses, which translates to increased sales prices or higher monthly rents. Additionally, by requiring less parking spaces along with new housing, we can encourage more usage of alternative transportation, which is beneficial to our Climate Action Plan targets that aim to decrease vehicle trips and encourage more transit, bicycling and walking trips within Transit Priority Areas (TPA).

The City will be developing revised parking standards within TPAs so that we are not unnecessarily requiring excessive parking in development projects. Possible parking concepts include parking maximums, special allowances for affordable housing development and possible standard reductions for projects that apply programs that reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel demand (Transportation Demand Management).

This effort will require a parking study to determine options and impacts before specific standards can be developed and proposed.

Implementation of SB743 and Vehicle Miles Traveled  
Summer 2018

The City of San Diego has been participating for the past couple of years in regional working groups to discuss the implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743. The bill was adopted with the focus of reducing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions statewide by reforming the CEQA analysis from level of service (LOS) to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Planning Department staff has initiated this work effort creating a core group of CEQA and mobility planning technical experts that will be developing VMT thresholds for the City of San Diego and preparing the necessary environmental review process for this transition, and creating a guide for mobility studies. This effort also entails outreach to key stakeholders, CEQA practitioners, and traffic engineers, as well as close coordination with Development Services Department and other departments within the City of San Diego to ensure a smooth transition and implementation upon adoption.
FINANCING & PROCESSING STRATEGIES

With a growing homeless population in our City and region it is important that we work to increase the number of affordable housing units to help those that are critically in need of housing. Bringing additional resources to bear will help to increase our stock of affordable units.

**Housing Successor Fund & NOFA**

Winter 2017

In February ’17, the City of San Diego and Civic San Diego announced a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for $25 million to help fund affordable housing developments targeting households demonstrating low to extremely low income. The funding, which comes from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund (LMIHAF), will be used to support the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of housing that will provide long-term affordability. It will help with gap financing, at below market interest rates, in order to leverage the City’s investment between the projected total development costs and other available funding sources. The City is currently evaluating submissions for funding and will look to bring forward recommendations for awarding of funds by the end of the year.

**Transit Oriented Development Fund**

Summer 2017

The San Diego Housing Commission (SDHC) and Civic San Diego (CivicSD) have engaged Forsyth Advisors to develop a Transit Oriented Development fund that would leverage $20 million in public assets at a 3:1 ratio to provide finance options that are currently unavailable or scarce. The City of New York has deployed $400 million in financing using the model of an off-balance sheet fund that is nimble and can deploy assets in 60 days or less. The current market need are for small scale projects, around 50 units, rehab, and long-term acquisition financing. SDHC and CivicSD are targeting June for City Council with the first round of financing being deployed in the Fall.

**HOUSING INVENTORY ANNUAL REPORT**

Summer 2017

What gets measured gets managed. Currently, the City of San Diego does not do a comprehensive report of its housing inventory and greater housing outlook. Developing an annual report that compiles information on San Diego’s housing will help us to better understand the crisis we are facing in the short term and also help us gauge what strategies are producing results in the long term.

The report, which will be conducted annually, will seek to compile information such as existing housing supply for both market rate and affordable units, number of units approved by the City, as well as vacancy rate and other metrics to help the City have a better understanding of San Diego’s housing situation.

The first report will be released in the summer of 2017.
CONTINUING COMMITMENTS TO HOUSING

While new policies like those in this initiative are necessary to begin addressing our housing crisis, it is important to not lose sight of existing work being done by the City to help meet these goals as well. Long term commitments to community planning and regulatory reform are necessary to ensure that we can continue to improve the delivery of housing units to our City and region.

Comprehensive Community Plan Updates

The City relies on community plans to establish the land use allowances and community-specific policies to implement the General Plan and City of Villages strategy. There are 49 community plans within the City, most of which were last updated in the ‘90s. A lot has changed since then and the policies reflected in those documents are outdated, which frustrates the market’s ability to be responsive to the growing demand for quality affordable housing. While the City has comprehensively updated nine community plans since 2014, more needs to be done. Benefits of an updated community plan are provided below.

- **More By-Right Development**
  Residential and mixed-use development projects that comply with updated zoning, community plans, and applicable regulations will be processed by-right.

- **Expedited CEQA Review**
  Projects requiring CEQA review will be able to tier off the CPU EIR (§15183), where projects will simply need to complete a ‘compliance checklist.’ This will substantially reduce the amount of analysis that needs to be completed by applicants.

- **Zoning Efficiencies**
  The City is moving away from community specific specialized zones to more citywide standards, resulting in simplified and consistent application of regulations.

- **Updated Facilities Financing Plans**
  Updated plans result in more infrastructure projects that can be eligible for reimbursement.

Updating community plans are a high priority of this administration and all newly initiated updates will be completed within three years, instead of the traditional six to eight year processing period.

Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist

The CAP establishes a framework for the City of San Diego to address climate change and significantly reduce its overall carbon footprint. Last year the City adopted the CAP Consistency Checklist which allows projects that demonstrate compliance with the CAP to rely on its environmental analysis for greenhouse gas emissions (GHG’s). The checklist will save project applicants time and money by not having to conduct those analyses themselves provided they meet the prescribed mitigation actions identified in the checklist.
Development Services Department Improvements

The City's Development Services Department (DSD) is responsible for permitting, reviewing, and inspecting new development. The role that DSD has in the delivery of new housing is a significant responsibility. If the department does not operate efficiently it can have negative impacts on the cost of new development. Excessive processing times and costs can translate directly into the eventual price a renter or homebuyer pays for the unit.

Over the past several years, improving the functionality of DSD has been a major priority. Numerous steps have been taken to streamline processes, improve coordination and customer service, simplify requirements and the municipal code, and incorporate new technologies. Below is a comprehensive list of efforts undertaken by DSD to improve the department's operations:

- **Customer Service Training**
  - Reactivated department wide trainings
  - Established extended customer service hours targeting homeowners and small businesses
  - Extended operating hours including evening permit review on Thursday 5-7pm as well as Saturday inspections

- **Implemented OpenDSD**
  - 3 years of project data on searchable internet database
  - Online payment and inspection
  - Real-time permit and enforcement status

- **Completed 9th Land Development Code Update**
  - 57 Code Amendments and streamlining measures
  - Streamlined CEQA noticing
  - Eased permit utilization restrictions
  - Clarified previously conforming regulations

- **Completed 10th Land Development Code Update**
  - 38 Code Amendments and streamlining measures
  - Eased permit utilization for CIP projects
  - Expanded use of shared parking

- **Fee Modifications**
  - Simplified Fee Structure reducing 538 fees into 313 fees
  - Converted 62 deposit accounts to flat fees
  - Allowed for fee deferrals

- **Revised Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program**
  - 15% increase in the Density Bonus (35% to 50%)
  - Increased incentives from 3 to 5
  - Process Level improvements
  - Implemented AB744’s Parking Reductions for Affordable Housing Developments
  - Allows for off-site Affordable Housing units with approved agreements

- **Implementation of Accela**
  - New project management software to replace dated PTS system
  - Will reduce dependency on internal staff
• Flexible and expandable platform
• Faster and more accurate permitting
• Reduce paper files
• Reduce trips to Development Services Center
• Implementation in June of 2017

• **Processing Time Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Year from</th>
<th>Reviews completed</th>
<th>% of time meeting Goal</th>
<th>% completed &lt;3 review cycles</th>
<th>Number of Inspections</th>
<th>% of inspections &lt;2 Days</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>71358</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>116671</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>86848</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>125295</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>93653</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>139326</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>101992</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>155201</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DSD has maintained very high service levels under increasing pressures caused by additional volume and more complex building and storm water regulations. Over the past year, some sections have dramatically improved their performance. For example the Drainage and Grades Section has increased its percentage of on-time reviews from approximately 65% to 90% on time.
2017 Regional Housing Progress Report

- Purposes
- SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 (Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Incentives)
- Housing permitting and construction over the past 14 years
Housing in the San Diego Region

- Slow housing recovery
- Small increase in permitting affordable housing
- 70 percent of San Diegans cannot currently afford a median priced home
- Rent prices > wage increases

Lack of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FY 2008-2009</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Redevelopment</td>
<td>$90,581,576</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Housing Bonds and Housing Programs</td>
<td>$35,837,777</td>
<td>$17,991,618</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>$52,658,415</td>
<td>$37,160,333</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$179,077,768</td>
<td>$55,151,951</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: California Housing Partnership Corporation, State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development, City of San Diego, Housing Authority of the City of San Diego, 2008-2009 and 2015-2016 Annual Financial Reports.
Local Jurisdiction Housing Data

- New building permits issued
- Acquisition/rehabilitation units
- Preserved at-risk units

Housing in the San Diego Region

San Diego Region New Housing Units by Income Category

- Very-Low
- Low
- Moderate
- Above-Moderate
Regional Housing Needs Assessment Goals

Share of New Housing Units in the San Diego Region by Income Category
January 1, 2010 - December 31, 2016 (7 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very-Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above-Moderate</th>
<th>Total for all Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>42,025</td>
<td>50,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Permitted</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>30,610</td>
<td>67,220</td>
<td>161,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>33,592</td>
<td>23,354</td>
<td>28,535</td>
<td>25,195</td>
<td>111,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Housing Dashboard

- Data included
- Housing units permitted
- Acquisition/rehabilitation
- SDHF affordable housing inventory
- RHNA allocations
- Units permitted for the RHNA cycle
## Regional Planning Technical Working Group

- Report presented on October 12, 2017
- Describe local government role in housing permitting and construction
- Explain other factors affecting RHNA progress

## Next Steps

- List of local resources, programs, and incentives to promote more housing development
- *TransNet* grants reward production of affordable housing through Board Policy No. 033
- Track statewide housing legislation implementation
- Monitor housing development in the region
CALIFORNIA’S HOUSING GAP

- Home prices have increased 15% since ’09
- Almost 70% L/VL income households spend >50% of their income on housing
- Home prices 150% above national average
- Roughly $140B in lost economic output per year
SAN DIEGO’S HOUSING GAP

- Countywide median home price $612K
- Average $1,432 spent in rent on a one-bedroom apartment
- 57% of renters spend >30% towards rent
- Approx. $2.5B in economic loss due to high housing costs

SAN DIEGO’S HOUSING GAP

- Over past decade, population growth averaged 1.2% per year
- Businesses finding it difficult to attract and retain talent
- An estimated 220K units needed by 2028
SAN DIEGO’S HOUSING GAP

- Over past decade, population growth averaged 1.2% per year
- Businesses finding it difficult to attract and retain talent
- An estimated 220K units needed by 2028
CLOSING THE HOUSING GAP

IDENTIFY “HOT SPOTS”
- Infill development
- Intensify housing in transit areas
- Add units to existing single-family homes

Remove Barriers
- More ‘by-right’ development opportunities
- Accelerate land-use approvals
- Promote affordable housing development

Reduce the Cost
- Align impact fees with housing objectives
- Prioritize state/local funding

Mayor’s ‘Housing SD’ Package Aims to Lower Costs, Promote Building Near Transit & Cut Red Tape to Address Housing Affordability Crisis
June 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>议题</th>
<th>Hot Spot</th>
<th>Remove Barriers</th>
<th>Reduce Costs</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>联伴单元激励 (Companion Unit Incentives)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>可负担可持续快速推行计划 (Affordable/Sustainable Expedite Program)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>房屋继承基金和NOFA (Housing Successor Fund &amp; NOFA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1637( Gloria): 中等收入住房 (AB1637(Gloria): Middle-income Housing)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>环境简化审查（CEQA 15183核对表） (Streamlined Env. Review (CEQA 15183 Checklist))</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct ‘17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>第11版土地开发代码更新 (11th Land Development Code Update)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb ‘18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>轨道优先地区停车标准 (Transit Priority Area Parking Standards)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb ‘18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>可负担住房法令更新 (Affordable Housing Ordinance Update)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar ‘18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>发展影响费计算 (Development Impact Fee Calculations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>May ‘18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>能源和VMT标准 (Mobility and VMT Standards)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun ‘18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>轨道导向开发基金 (Transit Oriented Development Fund)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>Aug ‘18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>中等收入密度奖金法令更新 (Middle Income Density Bonus Ordinance)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb ‘19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公园主计划 (Park Master Plan)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall ‘19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>综合社区计划更新 (Comprehensive Community Plan Updates)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-Going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPANION (2ND DWELLING) UNITS

NO SPECIAL HEIGHT LIMITS
✓ 同基区规定相同
✓ 单元位于车库

Expanded Setback Allowances
✓ 同基区规定相同
✓ 零后退线于街道

Reduced Parking Requirements
✓ 无需额外停车在轨道优先地区
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**AFFORDABLE HOUSING DENSITY BONUS**

**INCREASING DENSITY BONUS**
- State Law allows up to 35%
- City allows up to 50%

**Reward Rule Followers**
- 10% additional density bonus if project does not use incentives/waivers

**Encourages Micro-Units**
- 100% density bonus
- No deviations from standards

---

**MIDDLE INCOME DENSITY BONUS**

**MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES**
- 150% AMI (= $100k for a family of two)
- School teachers, nurses, fire fighters

**Density Bonus**
- include % of low and middle income units
- 25% density bonus
- Eligible for incentives/waivers
- Still pay in-lieu inclusionary fee

**Target Market-Rate Builders**
- Encourage market-rate developers to build subsidized; not take away from affordable
VMT & MOBILITY STANDARDS

WHAT’S WRONG WITH LOS?
- Congested urban areas already at unacceptable LOS
- Urban infill projects have a high burden to mitigate
- “Sprawl” gets free pass if no congestion in area
- Complicated calculation

What’s Right about VMT?
- Connectivity over capacity
- Reduces mitigation burden on infill projects
- Facilitates ped, bike & transit improvements
- Looks at mobility holistically

COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATES

CITY OF VILLAGES
- Increase density/intensity along TPA
- ‘By-Right’ Development

Expedited CEQA Review
- CEQA §15183
- CAP Consistency Checklist (GHG compliance)

Updated Facilities Financing Plans
- Remove outdated/unnecessary projects
- Balance growth with infrastructure
COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATES

✓ 2008 GP UPDATED
✓ 49 COMMUNITY PLANS
✓ 9 CPUs COMPLETED
HELPING CLOSE THE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY GAP
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Over the past decade, new housing development has not kept pace with job or population growth, resulting in housing costs that have increased at a much faster rate than income levels. With a growing population and a county median home price of nearly $510,000, more and more families are finding it increasingly difficult to afford a place to live in San Diego. Additionally, many economic analysts have reported that the single greatest threat to our region’s economy is the high cost of local housing.

The time that is involved in processing development permits, coupled with associated processing costs and impact fees represents a significant expense that can add to the overall cost of a new house. In fact, some reports say that the added costs can range from anywhere between 15 and 40 percent to the price of a new home. This, coupled with community plans that have not been comprehensively updated since the early 1990s frustrates the market’s ability to be responsive to this growing demand for quality affordable housing.

Among other duties, the Planning Department is responsible for developing and updating land use policies and programs that help guide future growth in each of the 52 community planning areas within the City of San Diego. Given this role, it is important that the Department concentrate its efforts on revising those policies to help address housing availability and affordability, while taking into account community values and priorities.

Priorities for this year’s Work Program will focus on continuing to comprehensively update the City’s aging community plans in an effort to make them more responsive to current and future needs, as well as revising land use regulations to remove unnecessary barriers and help simplify and streamline our permit review processes. Additionally, the Department will be evaluating the impact fee methodology in order to better scale the fees based on the type of development and commensurate impacts to the community infrastructure. These actions coincide with the City’s Strategic Plan and the Mayor's Housing SD Initiative for 2017.

This year’s efforts will focus on ways of increasing the supply of affordable housing stock, while protecting and maintaining the unique quality and character of our communities, which collectively help make San Diego...America’s Finest City.

We intend to manage this plan to completion — on time and on budget.

JEFF MURPHY
Director, Planning Department
Mission Statement & Department Vision
The Planning Department works to protect and create great places, and to foster a more sustainable future. To guide how this work is accomplished within the City organization, the Department collectively prepared and implemented a Department Tactical Plan, which sets forth the Department’s mission, vision, goals and objectives. The Department adheres to these principles and reinforces them daily. The goals laid out in this plan were carefully chosen and developed to ensure all Department staff focus their efforts on serving San Diego's residents, visitors, businesses and communities. Working together, we will provide world-class service that is worthy of our world-class city.

DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTATIONS

Transparency & Open Government
Transparency promotes accountability and informs citizens of government activities. It is important for the Department to disclose information quickly and accurately in a form that the public can easily access and use. New technologies should be used to provide information to the public about the Department's operations and actions, and incorporate online engagement in the Department's public participation processes in order to offer people more ways to be heard.

Collaboration & Partnerships
The effectiveness and quality of government actions and decisions are enhanced with public engagement. The community planning groups and the Community Planners Committee are officially recognized by the City as the voice of the community regarding their respective community plans and the City's General Plan. In addition to working with these groups, the Department offers a variety of stakeholders and interest groups the opportunity to participate in policymaking and provide the City with their collective expertise and information. Stakeholder representation needs to be diverse and include representatives from a wide range of community, industry and public interest organizations, as well as other City departments, neighboring jurisdictions and agencies. This ensures that long-range plans represent a unified vision and implementation strategy.

Balanced & Professional
Planning Department staff conducts their duties with honesty and integrity, lives up to its commitments and openly communicates the Department's processes and actions to the public. When developing forward-thinking solutions to challenging land use issues, staff balances public input and suggestions with best professional practices, legal mandates, and current City policies.
MISSION:
“To envision, plan and create a world-class city”

VISION:
“An innovative and collaborative leader in planning”

Effective & Efficient Operations
The City must always look for opportunities to improve services in order to effectively serve and support the communities. The Planning Department continually improves operational processes and enhances services through efficient and effective methods and technologies to ensure an organization that is customer-focused, proactive, consistent and responsive.
The Planning Department is responsible for the long-range planning of San Diego's communities and neighborhoods. Given the complex nature of the City's planning initiatives, the Department has been structured into three divisions, each having focused specialties and staff with multi-disciplinary expertise.

**Long-Range Planning Division**

The Long-Range Planning Division maintains a comprehensive, citywide General Plan; updates and amends the City's community plans; and facilitates implementation of those plans.

**Community Planning Section**

The City has 52 diverse community planning areas, 49 adopted community plans, and 42 recognized community planning groups. Community plans are components of the General Plan that provide site-specific land-use designations and policy direction to implement the community's vision of the future, while also maintaining consistency with the General Plan.

**Mobility Planning Section**

The Mobility Element of the General Plan establishes goals and policies aimed to further the attainment of a balanced multimodal transportation network that provides for all users of the public right of way; pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit. This section prepares and develops mobility studies, plans, and programs that identify long range multimodal transportation improvements, as well as the analysis of such plans under California Environmental Quality Act. Mobility planning is integrated with the land use and climate change planning to embrace sustainability goals through the preparation of active transportation plans, updates to community plan mobility element, and mode share analyses.

**Environment & Policy Analysis Division**

This Division creates and implements General Plan policies related to parks and recreation, land use, conservation, resource management and environmental protection. This Division also updates and creates codes and regulations.
CEQA & Environmental Policy Section

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) has been in existence for over four decades. CEQA requires state and local agencies to identify any significant environmental impacts of their discretionary or legislative actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible. CEQA is a process for disclosure and better decision-making in consideration of the environment.

This section of the Department establishes CEQA-specific policies for the City, reviews all City projects and other actions under CEQA for potential environmental impacts, prepares environmental documents, directs the work of outside environmental consultants, and provides CEQA training to community planning groups.

Park Planning Section

The Recreation Element of the General Plan established goals and policies to preserve, protect and enhance public recreation opportunities and facilities throughout the City for all users. The objective is to appropriately utilize the City’s natural environment and resources, to build upon existing recreation facilities and services, to help achieve an equitable balance of recreational resources, and to adapt to future recreation needs.

This Section reviews projects to ensure adherence to General Plan standards for population-based parks, as well as impacts to the City’s open space park system, manages updates and amendments to existing park general development plans, and prepares community plan recreation elements. Responsibilities also include identifying funds for, and creation of, new park-related capital improvement projects, coordination of new joint-use facilities with school districts, and review of land acquisitions for future park sites.

Multiple Species Conservation Program

The Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is a regional habitat conservation and protection program that also helps streamline permit reviews and provides a level of consistency and certainty in the discretionary review process. The MSCP was developed to preserve the City’s network of habitat and open space lands, protecting bio-diversity and enhancing the region's quality of life. With this program in place, the development community benefits because there are pre-established mitigation requirements for impacts, no disruptions from future listings under the state and federal endangered species acts for covered species, and permit authority is granted to the City by state and federal agencies. This saves applicants time and money.
This Section reviews discretionary projects for impacts to vernal pools and lands within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area preserve, contributes to community plan updates, works to acquire new Multi-Habitat Planning Area open space lands, amends the program to address new issues (i.e., Vernal Pool Habitat Conservation Plan), reviews other jurisdictions’ environmental documents, fosters projects subject to the wetland deviations through the concurrence process with federal and state wildlife agencies, and coordinates with the federal and state wildlife agencies on regional issues.

Policy & Ordinance Development Section
It is important that City codes and regulations are current and relevant to address today’s land use challenges. New technologies, trends and industries have inspired carefully-crafted regulations that maximize flexibility while also protecting the public for unintended consequences. While the City land use codes are comprehensive, staff and the public sometimes encounter situations where a proposal is not clearly defined in code, which can cause confusion on how to appropriately regulate that land use. In other situations, staff and public have found certain codes vague, unclear or conflicting, resulting in disagreement in code interpretation.

This Section processes regular updates to the City’s land development policies and ordinances in order to make them more streamlined and responsive to today’s regulatory landscape. With direction from the Mayor and City Council, the Section looks to modernize regulations and remove barriers without sacrificing public safety, environment or quality of life. The Section, in collaboration with Development Services Department’s Permit Review staff, also contributes to community plan updates to help ensure that the plan policies are implemented effectively.

Historic Preservation Planning Section
The City of San Diego recognizes the benefits of historical resource preservation to the community as well as to individual property owners. Preservation efforts stabilize neighborhoods, promote cultural heritage tourism, and contribute to a vibrant, diverse and dynamic urban landscape, among other benefits. This section is responsible for updating and developing policies and programs that protect the unique history, architecture and character of San Diego.
Financial & Administrative Services Division

The Financial & Administrative Services Division serves as the center for all financial, fiscal and administrative activities for the Department.

Development Impact Fee Section

This section is responsible for developing, updating and administering programs and plans that provide funding sources to assist in the financing of community serving infrastructure, such as roads, parks, recreation facilities, libraries, and fire and police stations. Some of the more specific financing programs under this section include City administration of development impact fees and the update of Public Facilities Financing Plans (PFFP) and Impact Fee Studies (IFS), which provide for the collection of impact fee revenues and infrastructure planning. Additionally, Facilities Financing administers the City of San Diego Statewide Community Infrastructure Program (SCIP), the City of San Diego Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP), the City of San Diego Housing Impact Fee (HIF) and the City's Impact Fee Deferral Program (IFDP). In addition to administering impact fees, Facilities Financing negotiates reimbursement agreements with developers for the provision of community serving improvements.

Fiscal & Administrative Services Section

This section is responsible for the administration of the financial affairs and internal support activities specific to the Planning Department, including consultant contract and grant program monitoring. The section manages the annual General Fund budget of roughly $12.75 million, two operating special funds with a combined budget of more than $5.55 million, and a portfolio of grants of approximately $18.4 million; and provides financial, analytical, procurement, payroll, and personnel support for the department. In addition, the section oversees Brown Act compliance, Public Records Act requests, and community planning group support.

Mapping & IT Support Section

This Section provides Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping and data analyses to both the Planning and Economic Development departments that are essential to the preparation of the City's long-range plans and economic development initiatives. The Section also provides IT support services for both departments. GIS mapping provides data processing, analysis and report generation that are used as technical tools in conducting the Department's work plans and supporting key decision-making processes. The Section prepares maps for inclusion in additional reports, studies, presentations, and other purposes as needed. In addition, the Section provides IT services for business application implementation and support, IT budget development and monitoring, IT procurement, liaison with the City's Department of Information Technology, inventory and management of systems, copiers and cell phones, as well as website management.
The types of projects and programs the Department works will fall within one of the following five categories.

---

### Community Plan Updates / General Plan Amendments

Projects that fall under this category are focused on updates and major amendments to the City’s community plans. The preparation of community plan updates and the maintenance of the General Plan are core functions of the Planning Department. Community plans are updated to reflect the community’s vision of the future, implement the General Plan, reflect changes that have taken place since the community plan was last updated, and proactively anticipate future needs. As the updates currently in process are completed, new updates will be initiated in accordance with the Department’s data-driven prioritization system.

In addition, it is anticipated that focused amendments to the General Plan’s Land Use and Community Planning, Mobility and Conservation elements will need to be completed in order to reflect changes in state law related to climate change and mobility planning, and expansion of the planned regional transit system.

Refer to Appendix A for a list of pending projects.

---

WORK PRODUCT – CATEGORIES

### Citywide Planning Initiatives

Projects under this category can be described as land use policy documents that are generally single-focused, generally applied citywide, and address a particular policy topic such as outdoor recreation, multi-modal transportation, municipal code updates, or environmental resource protection. Examples of projects that fall under this category include CEQA Significance Thresholds, and Traffic Guidelines. Regional and state grants are available to help fund some of these initiatives.

Refer to Appendix B for a list of pending projects.

### Development Impact Fee Plan Updates

Most of the projects under this category involve updating Public Facilities Financing Plans (PFFP) and Impact Fee Studies (IFS) for the various community planning areas. In many cases, a PFFP/IFS is developed in conjunction with an associated community plan update or amendment.

Refer to Appendix C for a list of existing Development Impact Fee Plans.
Special Study Area Projects / Transit-Oriented Development Projects

Projects that fall under this category are largely grant funded and often involve area specific land use planning and/or infrastructure improvements. Examples of projects that fall under this category include Active Transportation Plans, Transit Oriented Development Plans, the Safe Routes to School Program, and site-specific park planning. Bike/pedestrian facilities, way-finding signage and streetscape improvements also fall under this category. Projects under this category are identified and developed as grant opportunities arise and staffing resources are available. Refer to the Workload and Assignments Section for details.

Parks and Recreation Plans / Policies

Projects that fall under this category are largely focused on creating park-related policies, developing plans for park-related capital improvement projects, coordination of new joint-use facilities, and other related long-range policy documents (i.e., Park Master Plan).

Refer to Appendix D for a list of existing parks and recreation plans/policies.
“When everything is a priority, then nothing is a priority. If everything is important, then nothing is important.”
— Simon Fulleringer (attributed), McGill University

**Given** the number, age and complexity of our land use plans, there is an extensive list of projects that require attention. It is not practical or feasible to address them all at once, so they must be prioritized. As such, a series of ranking criteria for each of the previously described categories has been developed.

Updates to the community plans are a priority of the Mayor’s Office, the Council, and the community. Accordingly, Department resources shall be focused on the community plan updates as its first priority. To the extent that resources are available to work on other projects, the prioritization criteria outlined in each respective category shall apply.

### PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

---

**Community Plan Updates**

A data-driven prioritization system has been developed to assist in identifying what community plans will be worked on in the coming years. The evaluation factors are summarized below.

**A. Age of Plan**

Older community plans are generally in need of an update. However, some of these plans may still be largely relevant and only require a “clean-up” revision.

**B. Community Plan Amendments**

A high number of plan amendments may indicate that changes are needed to ensure that the community plan maintains relevance in light of development pressures; that cumulative issues are being addressed; and that aspects of the plan that are unnecessarily triggering plan amendments are resolved.

**C. Population and Employment Growth**

Communities that have a high potential for population and employment growth may need refinements in their community plans to address public facility needs, multi-modal mobility, urban design, sustainability, and other factors. In addition, staff considered whether a community includes former Redevelopment Agency lands, since the City still encourages public and private investment in these areas.
D. Transit Priority Areas

A Transit Priority Area (TPA) is within one-half mile of a major transit stop that is existing, or planned as a part of the Regional Transportation Plan. Communities that have high TPA coverage would rank higher in this category, in recognition of the policy support for transit-oriented development in the City’s General Plan and at all levels of government. In addition, the City’s Climate Action Plan calls for increased transit, walking and biking to occur in TPAs. This factor also considered whether planned transit improvements would be implemented in the near- or long-term.

E. Parks Equity

Communities that have a high population-based park acreage deficit per General Plan standards would receive a higher weighting in this category, in recognition of the need to identify additional park acreage and/or equivalencies as a part of a community plan update.
Additional factors that are important to consider include:

- Prime industrial lands – Need and availability of industrial lands may influence when an update is initiated.
- Community support – Planning Department staff works in partnership with the community planning groups and other stakeholders when conducting community plan updates.
- Ability to leverage funds – Availability of grant funding or other sources of funding could help influence when an update is initiated.

Citywide Planning Initiatives

To help identify and prioritize projects under this category, the following six criteria have been developed. Projects may fit into multiple categories, which will increase priority value.

A. Legal Mandate
   The project is required in order to comply with state or federal law.

B. Strategic Plan
   The project helps implement the policies of the City's Strategic Plan.

C. City Council
   The project has been directed by the City Council via public hearing.

D. General Plan
   The project is specifically listed in the General Plan Action Plan.

E. Improves Process
   The project will reduce time and costs without adversely impacting health, safety or quality of life.

F. Community Impact
   The project will benefit a broad audience of stakeholders.
Development Impact Fee Plan Updates

A data-driven prioritization system has been developed to assist in ranking development impact fee plan updates. The five evaluation factors considered include whether the associated community plan is being updated; whether the associated community plan is being amended; the age of the community financing plan; the level of development taking place in the community; and any special considerations that may affect the need or timing of an update. These evaluation criteria and their quantitative weighting are discussed below. As with all staff assignments, Public Facilities Financing Plans (PFFP) and Impact Fee Studies (IFS) updates will be weighed taking into consideration available staffing. The actual timing of a development impact fee plan update may be contingent on the final schedule of a community plan update or amendment project.

A. Community Plan Update (CPU)

PFFPs and IFSs are implementation measures of community plans and need to be updated commensurately with community plan updates. Any PFFP or IFS associated with a community plan update is given the highest priority.

B. Community Plan Amendment (CPA)

Major community plan amendments (either privately or publicly initiated) often require a corresponding update to the community’s financing plan. The CPA may among other things create additional and/or revised infrastructure needs, revise the development mix, revise the development forecast, and revise the Transportation Phasing Plan (TPP) requirements.

C. Age of Community Financing Plan

Age of the plan affects the accuracy of the project cost estimates, timing of future development, the potential for modification to an existing phasing plan, and the accuracy of the resultant impact fee. Financing plans have two categories of impact fees, FBAs and DIFs. FBA communities are located in urbanizing areas of the City and have a large volume of development taking place. FBA-based PFFPs are recommended to be updated every two years to regularly monitor and adjust the plan to reflect the development activity and the required infrastructure needed to serve the residents. DIF-based IFSs represent older communities (mostly in central area of the City), which are at, or near, build-out with the majority of development consisting of smaller scale redevelopment and infill opportunities. IFSs are recommended to be updated every five years in order to refresh the cost data and reflect changing community priorities. Due to the greater level of development activity in FBA communities and the recommended frequent updates (every two years) to reflect changing circumstances, the FBA communities are weighted higher than DIF communities.
D. General Development Activity

A large increase in development activity could result in the need to update a community financing plan to accelerate project funding based on the additional revenue being received that is above projections. The purpose of this type of update is to provide the infrastructure needed to serve a rapidly increasing population. Several of the PFFPs include Transportation Phasing Plan (TPP) requirements in order to regulate the pace of development to be commensurate with the provision of infrastructure. As part of a plan update based on accelerated development, the existing TPP may need to be modified.

E. Special Considerations

The prioritization system was developed to provide a data-driven process for ranking development impact fee plan updates within the context of the Planning Department Work Program. Notwithstanding, there will be occasions when staffing considerations, fiscal impacts, development activity, necessity to update project cost statements, creation of a new community financing plan, environmental concerns, impacts to the Work Program, or other external circumstances could drive the need for an update, or cause a potential future update to remain low on the overall prioritization list.

- Special Study Area Projects / Transit-Oriented Development Projects

Selection and ranking criteria for these projects follow the selection process as established by the Grants and Dedications Division of the Assistant Chief Operating Officer’s Office.

- Parks and Recreation Plans / Policies

To help identify and prioritize projects under this category, the following six criteria have been developed. Projects may fit into multiple categories, which will increase priority value.

A. Age of Plans/Policies
Older policy documents are typically in need of update to reflect current conditions and changes in circumstances.

B. Strategic Plan
The plans/policies help implement the policies of the City's Strategic Plan.

C. City Council
The project has been directed by the City Council via public hearing.

D. General Plan
The project is specifically listed in the General Plan Action Plan.

E. Improves Process
The project will reduce time and costs, without impacting health, safety or quality of life.

F. Community Impact
The project will benefit a broad audience of stakeholders.
## WORKLOAD AND ASSIGNMENTS
### A Rolling Two-Year Outlook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONE-TIME PROJECTS</th>
<th>FY2017/18</th>
<th>FY2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY 2017</td>
<td>CY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
<td>Apr-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Updates/General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra Mesa CPA - Street Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway - Pacific Highway CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendment - Safety Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio Logan CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clairemont CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa CPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Planning Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - Companion Units Ordinance Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Marijuana - Non-Retail Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - Affordable &amp; Sustainable Expedite Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - CEQA Section 15183 Checklist/Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide TPA Mode Split Guidelines for CPUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - Affordable Housing Density Bonus Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - 11th Code Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Significance Threshold / Mobility Thresholds (VMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal Pool Habitat Conservation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - Middle Income Housing Density Bonus Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Resiliency Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - Transit Priority Area Parking Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean 6 Sigma Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing SD - 12th Code Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On-going Assignments
1. Development Reviews
2. Department Initiatives
3. Privately-Initiated CPAs
4. General Plan Monitoring Report
5. Trainings/Meetings
6. Housing Element Annual Progress Report
## Development Impact Fee Plan Updates

- Mission Beach IFS
- Carmel Valley CV/PFFP
- Midway - Pacific Highway CPU/IFS
- Old Town CPU/IFS
- Peninsula IFS
- Torrey Highlands PFFP
- Barrio Logan CPU/IFS
- Otay Mesa PFFP
- Rancho Peñasquitos PFFP
- Linda Vista IFS
- Pacific Beach IFS
- Mission Valley CPU/IFS
- Pacific Highlands Ranch PFFP
- Kearny Mesa CPU/IFS
- Clairemont Mesa CPU/IFS

## Parks and Recreation Plans/Policies

- Mission Trails Park Master Plan Update
- Fiesta Island/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment
- De Anza Revitalization Plan/MB Plan Amendment
- Housing SD - Parks Master Plan
- Joint Use Program “Play all Day”

## Special Study Area Projects/TOD

- San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs
- Grantville Trolley Station TOP Plan
- Park de la Cruz Improvements
- Vernal Pool Acquisition in Otay
- Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan
- Morena Blvd. Station Area Specific Plan
- Kearny Mesa Smart Growth Area
- PB Beach Greenways, Parks and Transportation
- Linda Vista SRTS
- Potential Historic District Formation - North Park & Golden Hill
- Del Mar Heights Road Mobility Study
- Kearny Mesa Smart Growth Area
- PB Beach Greenways, Parks and Transportation
- Linda Vista SRTS
- Potential Historic District Formation - North Park & Golden Hill
- Del Mar Heights Road Mobility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONE-TIME PROJECTS</th>
<th>FY2017/18</th>
<th>FY2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY 2017</td>
<td>CY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Citywide Environmental Determinations
8. Developer Reimbursement Agreements
9. NEPA Review
10. Park Development Agreements
11. Review City-wide Surplus Sites for Park Acquisition
12. CIP Park Program
13. General Plan Maintenance Report
14. PFFP Generated - Trans/Planning Studies
FY2017 was an extremely productive year

The Department measures performance via two Key Performance Indicators, which are reflected below.

80 percent of achieved major milestones associated with planning initiatives

• In October, the City Council approved the comprehensive update to the North Park Community Plan and Golden Hill Community Plan.

• In November, an update to the San Ysidro Community Plan and Uptown Community Plan were approved, and in December the University City CPA was approved.

• Several financing plans were updated, including Torrey Pines (September), North Park (October), Golden Hill (October), Del Mar Mesa (November), San Ysidro (November) and Uptown (December).

• The North Bay Urban Greening Plan and Active Transportation Plan provided a street tree master plan and conceptual street designs incorporating improvements related to storm water, mobility and public health and completed in December.

• The Linda Vista Active Transportation Plan created a foundation for improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities by providing conceptual roadway and intersection improvements based on data collected, analyses and community input and was completed on time and within budget (December).

The KPI related to “planning initiatives” include projects listed in the following Work Product Categories: Community Plan Updates/General Plan, Development Impact Fee Projects and Special Study Area Projects.

The KPI related to “Environmental Resources Initiatives” involve projects under these Work Product Categories: Citywide Planning Initiatives and Parks and Recreation Plans/Policies.

An “Achieved Milestone” is defined as completing the project (i.e., Council action) by the specified date.

83 percent of achieved major milestones associated with environmental resource initiatives

• In July, the City Council adopted the Affordable Housing Density Bonus Amendments and Fair Housing Act Amendments.

• The Urban Tree Canopy Assessment was finalized, which found the City’s canopy coverage to be 13 percent — nearly double the previous estimate of 6.8 percent using satellite imagery.

• The annexation of a long-standing unincorporated County Island located in Southeastern San Diego was also presented to and approved by Council (December).

• In January, the Council adopted regulations for the sale of adult use marijuana (January)
• The Impact Fee Deferral Program continues to be successful with developers deferring over $35 million in FY2016, and $19 million through FY2017 mid-year.

• 27 active Developer Reimbursement Agreements were managed in FY2017 valued at approximately $400 million in infrastructure improvements in the communities.

• The Urban Forestry Program Five-Year Plan was prepared and adopted by City Council in December 2016.
Appendix A: Community Plan Update and General Plan Element

**General Plan**
- Conservation Element
- Economic Prosperity Element
- Historic Preservation Element
- Land Use & Community Planning Element
- Mobility Element
- Noise Element
- Public Facilities, Services & Safety Element
- Recreation Element
- Urban Design Element

**Community Plans**
- Black Mountain Ranch CPU
- Carmel Mountain Ranch CPU
- Carmel Valley CPU
- City Heights
- College CPU
- Del Mar Mesa CPU
- Downtown / Centre City
- East Elliott CPU
- Fairbanks Country Club CPU
- Kensington-Talmadge CPU
- La Jolla CPU
- Linda Vista CPU
- Miramar Ranch North CPU
- Mission Beach CPU
- Navajo CPU
- Normal Heights CPU
- No. City Future Urban Area
- Otay Mesa CPU
- Otay Mesa-Nestor CPU
- Pacific Beach CPU
- Pacific Highlands Ranch CPU
- Peninsula CPU
- Rancho Bernardo CPU
- Rancho Encantada CPU
- Rancho Peñasquitos CPU
- Sabre Springs CPU
- San Pasqual Valley CPU
- Scripps Miramar Ranch CPU
- Serra Mesa CPU
- Skyline Paradise Hills CPU
- Tierrasanta CPU
- Tijuana River Valley CPU
- Torrey Highlands CPU
- Torrey Hills CPU
- Torrey Pines CPU
- Via de la Valle CPU
Appendix B: Citywide Planning Initiatives

- ALUCP Implementation Overlay Amendment
- Annual Land Development Code Update
- Centralized Development Monitoring System
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Agriculture
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Air Quality
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Biology
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Historic
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Hydrology/WQ
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Land Use
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Minerals
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Noise
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Paleo
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Public Utilities
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Visual
- CEQA Significance Thresholds – Green House Gas
- City Business Continuity Plan
- Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan
- Coastal Development Permit Exemptions
- Comprehensive Emergency Exercise Program

Appendix C: Development Impact Fee Project List

Financing Plans
- Black Mountain Ranch PFFP
- Carmel Valley PFFP
- College Area IFS
- Del Mar Mesa PFFP
- Downtown IFS
- East Elliot IFS
- Encanto IFS
- Golden Hill IFS
- Greater North Park IFS
- La Jolla IFS
- Mid-City IFS
- Mira Mesa PFFP
- Navajo IFS
- North University City PFFP
- South University City IFS
- Subarea II - Future Urban Area
- Otay Mesa-Nestor IFS
- Pacific Highlands Ranch IFS
- Rancho Bernardo IFS
- Rancho Encantada PFFP
- Sabre Springs PFFP
- San Pasqual Valley IFS
- San Ysidro IFS
- Scripps Miramar Ranch PFFP
- Serra Mesa IFS
- Skyline Paradise Hills IFS
- Southeastern IFS
- Tierrasanta IFS
- Torrey Pines IFS
- Uptown IFS
- Via de la Valle IFS

EIR Guidelines
- FEMA Floodplain Management
- Incentive Programs for sustainable/clean tech
- LDC Transit Area Overlay Zone – Update
- Low Impact Development Ordinance Update
- Mobilehome Park & First Right of Refusal
- Noise Ordinance Update
- Parking Standards – Update
- Parking Standards for Smart Growth Develop
- Potential Historic District Regulations
- Sign Ordinance - Update
- Street Design Manual – Update
- Sustainable Incentives related to CP 600-27
- Tandem Parking Usage Tracking
- Telecom – Spectrum Act
- Traffic Impact Study Guidelines – Update
- Update Landscape Regulations
- Update Sign Regulations
Appendix D: Parks and Recreation Plans / Policies

Balboa Park Master Plan
Balboa Park Central Mesa Plan
Balboa Park East Mesa Precise Plan
Balboa Park Inspiration Point
Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study
Balboa Park Parking Management Action Plan for Central Mesa and Inspiration Point
Black Mountain Open Space Park
Famosa Slough Enhancement Plan
San Diego River Improvement Plan/NRMP
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan
Mariam Bear Memorial Park/NRMP
Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update
Otab Valley Regional Park Plan
San Diego River Park Master Plan
San Dieguito River Regional Park Plan
Sunset Cliffs Shoreline Park Master Plan
Tecolote Canyon Natural Park Master Plan - Amendment

Appendix E: Planning Department Organization Chart
The City of San Diego
Executive Complex Building
1010 Second Avenue, 12th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 235-5200
sandiego.gov