Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program

Bay Area Listening Workshop

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter Auditorium
Oakland, California
Wednesday, July 29, 2015
9:30-11:30 AM
Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Presentation – Allison Joe, Strategic Growth Council
   • Cap and Trade and AHSC
   • Round 1 Highlights

3. Successful Project: City, Transit, and Developer Panel
   • Abigail Thorne-Lyman, BART
   • Michele Byrd, City of Oakland
   • Orissa Stewart-Rose, Enterprise Community Partners

4. Introduction of Key Technical Assistance Providers
   • Orissa Stewart-Rose, Enterprise Community Partners
   • James Pappas, CHPC
   • Ann Cheng, Transform

5. Q&A and Feedback on Programs and Regulations
   • Strategic Growth Council, MTC and ABAG staff

6. Getting Ready for Round 2

7. Close and Wrap-Up
1. Welcome
AHSC Round One and the Bay Area

- 11 projects selected for award
- $47 million awarded (39% of statewide funds)
- Nearly 800 units of affordable housing
- 9 cities
- 10 projects in Priority Development Areas
2. Strategic Growth Council Presentation
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program

July 29, 2015  Oakland, CA
Vision of the AHSC Program

To fund projects that result in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and increase accessibility of housing, employment centers and key destinations through low-carbon transportation options such as walking, biking and transit.
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program

Transit-Oriented Developments

- Located within a ½ mile of High-Quality Transit

Required
- Affordable Housing or Housing-Related Infrastructure
- Transportation-Related Infrastructure

Optional
- Additional Capital or Program Uses
Integrated Connectivity Projects

- Must have Qualifying Transit
- May include affordable housing, but not required

- **Required**
  - At least one Capital Use
  - One Additional Capital or Program Use

- **Optional**
  - Additional Capital or Program Uses
What is Qualifying Transit?

- A transit line serving the public and includes various forms of fixed transit service (Rail Service and Bus Service) and Flexible Transit Service.
- Flexible Transit Service is characterized by flexible routing and scheduling of small/medium vehicles operating in shared-ride mode between pick-up and drop-off locations according to passenger needs. Flexible Transit Service includes vanpool, shuttle and feeder bus systems.
2014-15 Bay Area Projects

1) El Cerrito: Senior Mixed Use Apartments
2) Emeryville: 3706 San Pablo
3) Fremont: Central Commons
4) Hayward: Hayward Senior Apartments
5) Oakland: Camino 23
6) Oakland: Civic Center 14 Apartments
7) Richmond: Miraflores Senior Housing
8) San Francisco: Eddy & Taylor Family Housing and
9) San Francisco: Mission Bay South Block 6 East
10) San Jose: 777 Park
11) Walnut Creek: Riviera Family Apartments
Key Factors in Year One

• Project Readiness (Permits and Environmental Clearances)
• Other Funding Sources
• Housing Unit Density
• Proximity to Dense Job Centers
• Transit
• Caps
3. Successful Project: City, Transit, and Developer Panel

- Abigail Thorne-Lyman, BART
- Michele Byrd, City of Oakland
- Orissa Stewart-Rose, Enterprise Community Partners
Role of BART in AHSC Applications
• In May 2015, the BART Board approved moving forward with five AHSC applications
• Partner on three full applications
• Awarded two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Lead Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th Street Oakland</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Meta Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Lighting, Ped Improvements</td>
<td>Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Bike Improvements, Wayfinding</td>
<td>Meta Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BART Bike Parking Capital Program

Increasing bike access while reducing bikes onboard

April 2013

Eisen | Letunic
Transportation, Environmental and Urban Planning
Oakland’s Cross-Sector TOD Applicant Teams
SAHA’s Camino 23 – International Blvd

AHSC TOD award of $3,062,730

• SAHA infrastructure award = $2,239,705 for affordable housing unit development

• City of Oakland infrastructure award = $726,050 for International Blvd improvements (repaired sidewalks, lighting, special intersection paving)

• $46,975 for bulk purchase of free AC Transit for residents

• $50,000 for City of Oakland staff management of Ped and Bike Program
AHSC Practice
Orissa Stewart-Rose
Enterprise Community Partners
Northern California
(415) 400-0979
ostewart-rose@enterprisecommunity.org
Recommendations for AHSC Year 2

1. Start now!

2. Review Existing AHSC Program Materials
   1. Year One Award Report and Project Summaries
   2. AHSC Guidelines
   3. Feedback shared by partner agencies, cities and developers
   4. Related reports

3. Build connections
   a) Identify who will be the lead for AHSC work within your department/agency
   b) Identify what public and private partners you want to coordinate with
   c) Connect with TA providers
   d) Host informational meetings and share rough timelines

4. Assess and organize pipelines

5. Stay engaged throughout the Fall-Winter
El Cerrito Senior Mixed Use Apartments El Cerrito, Contra Costa County

• AHSC TOD Award for $5,657,872

• Eden award = $5,271,696 for affordable housing unit development

• City of El Cerrito award = $363,469 for Ohlone Greenway Enhancement Project (TRI)

• $22,680 for bulk purchase of free AC Transit passes for residents
Miraflores Senior Apartments, Richmond, Contra Costa County

- AHSC ICP Award for $5,077,558
- Eden award = $4,024,606 for affordable housing unit development
- City of Richmond award = $1,024,512 for Baxter Creek Greenbelt (Park + Bike/Ped connections)
- $28,440 for bulk purchase of free AC Transit passes for residents
4. Introduction of Key Technical Assistance Providers

- Orissa Stewart-Rose, Enterprise Community Partners
- James Pappas, CHPC
- Ann Cheng, Transform
Enterprise Community Partners - AHSC Practice

**Policy**

*In coordination with NPH, CHPC, Housing CA and Transform:*

- GGRF and AHSC Funding and Program Guideline Feedback
- Knit statewide relationships
- Spread AHSC awareness and cultivate program across counties

**Technical Assistance**

Support for public agencies and cross sector teams

- Capacity Assessments
- Informational convenings
- Co-Applicant Coordination
- Comprehensive application assistance
- Align technical assistance and grants
- Stage future applications

**Tools**

- Pipeline manager and partnership app
- Toolkit:
  - Year One Lessons Learned & Recommendations
  - Citation library for Co-benefits
  - Best Practices for program planning
  - Overview Packets
  - Process and templates
  - Messaging AHSC 101
Capacity Assessments
Partnership Facilitation
Guideline Clarification
Informational Convenings
Comprehensive Application Assistance
Process Management
Debriefs and lessons learned
Pipeline Prep
California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC)

James Pappas
Housing Preservation & Policy Research Manager
MTC AHSC Forum July 29th, 2015
California Housing Partnership’s Roles:

- Financial Consulting for Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
- Policy Analysis and Advocacy
- Research and Publications

Income, Location Efficiency, and VMT: Affordable Housing as a Climate Strategy

by

Gregory L. Newmark Ph.D and Peter M. Haas Ph.D
Center for Neighborhood Technology
2125 W. North Ave
Chicago, Illinois 60647
USA

gnewmark@cnt.org
pmh@cnt.org
Programs with Synergy Opportunities with AHSC

• Low Income Housing Tax Credits
  • Amenities scoring encourages walkability and access to transit

• Active Transportation Program
  • Bike and Pedestrian Activities and Trainings

• Low Carbon Transit Operations Program

• Transit and Intercity Rail Program
  • Ridership Synergies

• Transit Pass Programs
  • Discounts and bulk buying programs

• Solar and Energy Efficiency Programs
Translating AHSC’s emissions scoring tool, CalEEMod, to project design and financing

- **Deepest calculated savings** come from:
  - Density (but only up to 40 du)
  - Parking (but only up to 50% lower than ITE parking ratio)
  - Distance from Job Center (set at 5,000 jobs/mile statewide)
  - Distance from Transit
  - Transit subsidy/Transit passes
  - Mixed Use Commercial Centers (esp. grocery stores)
  - Size of project (units at as a multiplier for GHG score)

- Cannot interpret scale of many transit and pedestrian improvements, can lead to smaller scale TRIs
- **Dropping $$ requested is easier than including other measures to increase GHG reductions**
Common Issues with Housing/Transit Synergy

• **Control**
  - It is easier for Housing entities to control and influence on site improvements instead of major transportation upgrades. Vice versa for transit agencies.

• **Timing**
  - Transit and housing are planned, funded and developed on different time horizons.

• **Funding together vs. Planning together**
  - Synergies may not be enough to apply for funds jointly.

• **New and Unfamiliar partnerships**
  - Timing and control issues make partnerships new partnerships hard to form. Which pieces should each entity be responsible for? Who is the partner?: City, public works, local transit agency, regional transit agency.
Contacts:

For Information on CHPC’s financial consulting services:
Richard Mandel, Director of Financial Consulting
rmandel@chpc.net  (415)433-6804 x 312

For information on CHPC’s policy work:
Megan Kirkeby, Policy Director
mkirkeby@chpc.net  (916) 287-9855

For information on CHPC’s research work:
James Pappas, Housing Preservation & Policy Research Manager
jpappas@chpc.net  (415)433-6804 x 320
GreenTRIP

Housing California
AHSC Lessons
April 28, 2015

Jennifer West
GreenTRIP Policy Analyst
jwest@transformca.org
Lessons Learned: GHG Quantifications
Jennifer West, TransForm

• AHSC GHG evaluation
  – CalEEMod (based on CAPCOA quantifications)
  – ARB adjustments
  – Transit and Connectivity (TAC) for bike and ped projects (also new bus service, vanpools)

• CalEEMod does not reward all transit, bikeway and pedestrian improvements.

• Dropping $$ request may be easier than increasing GHG reductions to improve scores.
What was rewarded most?

• **Deepest GHG reductions** came from:
  – Density (ARB adjustment)
  – Proximity to Job Center (ARB adjustment)
  – Transit Subsidy with passes (ARB adjustment)
  – Parking reduction from ITE standard (CalEEMod)
  – Proximity to Transit stop (CalEEMod)
  – Mixed Use, grocery stores (CalEEMod)

• Size of project – with more units a project has more room for reductions from GHGs
ARB Adjustments for AHSC

• **Density:** CalEEMod max = 7.5 du/acre. ARB adjustment max = 40 du/acre. 30% reduction possible

• **Job Center:** ARB job center = census tract with 5,000 jobs/square mile. If less than 12 miles from site, GHGs are reduced. 20% reduction possible

• **Transit passes:** CalEEMod reduces for employees only. ARB added a residential transit pass subsidy reduction up to 20%, depending on $$ of subsidy, # of years offered, and % of residents covered.
Concerns

• **Affordability:** The model does not recognize depth of affordability – Extremely low-income and Moderate-income units may have the same GHG reduction. Moderate-income projects may score better due to a lower $$ request.

• **Consider GHG/unit rather than GHG/$$**

• **VMT Only:** AHSC only counted GHGs reduced through VMT reduction, so projects receive no GHG credit for adding Parks/Open Space/Urban Greening, nor for Energy Efficiency or Solar.

• **AHSC quantification does not reward lots of good things in excellent TOD development.**
## Basic Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of units</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density du/acre</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12 – 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to job center</strong></td>
<td>1 mile</td>
<td>0.2 mile</td>
<td>0 to &gt;12 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent GHGs reduced</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>35% - 107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GHG Reductions per unit over 30 years</strong></td>
<td>239 MTCO$_2$</td>
<td>187 MT CO$_2$</td>
<td>45 - 694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Positive Outcomes

• The state is putting new funds toward affordable housing that shows GHG reductions.

• Shows a real need for good modeling to guide funding decisions – GreenTRIP Connect tool (2015-16) provides that.

• Many of the traffic reduction strategies that GreenTRIP supports are included in the AHSC program.
5. Q&A and Feedback on Programs and Regulations
SGC Areas of Interest

1. Housing & Transportation Collaboration, including Transit
   • Did the program successfully encourage collaboration between the housing, active transportation, and transit sectors?

2. Process
   • Did this process adequately support attainment of the objectives of the program?

3. Technical Assistance
   • Was the technical assistance at various phases sufficient?
   • What areas of technical assistance should be prioritized for Year Two?

4. GHG Quantification Methodology
   • Does the GHG Quantification Methodology achieve the objectives of quantifying emissions from projects?
   • Did the GHG score weighting (55%) compared with the other scoring criteria achieve the objectives of the program?

5. Geographic Distribution
   • Did the program fund a diverse range of projects and place types?
Written public comments can be submitted to ahsc@sgc.ca.gov no later than July 31, 2015 to inform Fall Guideline Revision

Thank you!
6. Getting Ready for Round 2
## Estimated Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY 14, 2015</td>
<td>Sacramento Council Workshop: Lessons Learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY 20, 2015</td>
<td>Los Angeles Council Workshop: Lessons Learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY 29, 2015</td>
<td>MTC AHSC Listening Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG/SEPT 2015</td>
<td>Revise Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 2015</td>
<td>Release Draft Revised Guidelines and hold 3-4 Regional Workshops on Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINTER 2015</td>
<td>Revise Guidelines and hold Council Meeting to vote on approval of Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Close and Wrap-Up
Contact Information

- Michele Byrd, City of Oakland mbyrd@oaklandnet.com (510) 238-3714
- Doug Johnson, MTC DJohnson@mtc.ca.gov (510) 817-5846
- Woody Karp, Eden Housing wkarp@edenhousing.org (510) 740-3150 x305
- James Pappas, CHPC JPappas@chpc.net (415) 433-6804 x320
- Mark Shorett, ABAG MarkS@abag.ca.gov (510) 464-7994
- Orissa Stewart-Rose, Enterprise ostewart-rose@enterprisecommunity.org (415) 400-0979
- Abigail Thorne-Lyman, BART athorne@bart.gov (510) 464-6140
- Jennifer West, Transform jwest@transformca.org (510) 740-3150 x305