Staff Recommendations: AHSC Round 9

Published 12/03/2025

Table 1. Projects Recommended for Award

Project Name	Applicants	Broject Area Tuna	Project Jurisdiction	Total Units	Income Restricted Units		sing Funding	Programs	Transportation Funding	Total AHSC Award	Total Estimated AHSC GHG Emission Reductions (MTCO2e)	Disadvantaged Community (DAC)	Final Score Reason selected
Project Name	MidPen Housing Corporation; City of	Project Area Type	Jurisdiction	Units	Units	нои	sing Funding	Funding	Funding	Awaru	(WTCOZE)	(DAC)	Project Area Type
Stardust Gardens	Alameda	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Alameda	80		78 \$	29,553,361	\$647.000	\$14,350,000	\$44,550,361	46,237	Yes	92.33 Goal (ICP)
ital dust Gardens	East Bay Asian Local Development	integrated connectivity Project (ICP)	Alaineua	80		70 J	29,555,501	3047,000	714,330,000	544,550,501	. 40,237	163	Project Area Type
285 12th Street	Corporation; City of Oakland	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Oakland	65		64 Ś	20,873,066	\$379,000	\$14,621,000	\$35,873,066	62,725	Yes	89.00 Goal (TOD)
203 12(11 3(1 eet	Corporation, City of Cakland	Transit Oriented Development (100)	Odkidilu	03		04 \$	20,673,000	\$579,000	\$14,021,000	\$33,673,000	02,723	res	89.00 Goal (10D)
	Brinshore Development, L.L.C.; New Hope												
	Community Development Corporation;												Project Area Type
Tupelo	Housing Authority of Yolo County	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Woodland	73		72 \$	14,000,000	\$273,960	\$13,725,140	\$27,999,100	30,578	No	88.66 Goal (ICP)
								44 000 400		440.000.57			Project Area Type
Clover Apartments	AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Sacramento	348	34	44 \$	34,875,675	\$1,838,400	\$12,675,600	\$49,389,675	49,047	No	87.66 Goal (TOD)
	Mercy Housing California; City and County			407				4000 4000		447 570 400			Project Area Type
939 Market	of San Francisco	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	San Francisco	187	18	85 \$	35,000,000	\$866,100	\$11,713,000	\$47,579,100	38,527	No	87.00 Goal (TOD)
													Project Area Type
loss Center*	Linc Housing Corporation	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Los Angeles	124		22 \$	26,335,307	\$806,096		\$38,201,314		No	86.00 Goal (TOD)
/TA Capitol Station	MidPen Housing Corporation	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	San Jose	203	21	01 \$	35,000,000	\$546,125	\$13,793,306	\$49,339,431	. 56,471	No	85.00 GHG Reductions
													Project Area Type
MOSA Apartment Homes at Gateway*	E. Smith & Company	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	West Sacramento	114	1	13 \$	28,350,739	\$500,000	\$14,500,000	\$43,350,739	105,997	No	84.50 Goal (ICP)
													Project Area Type
318 4th Street	EAH Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Santa Monica	122	1	20 \$	35,000,000	\$623,600	\$14,374,999	\$49,998,599	16,404	Yes	83.50 Goal (TOD)
													Priority Population
Street Apartments	Community HousingWorks	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Sacramento	84		83 \$	21,861,776	\$648,800	\$10,770,000	\$33,280,576	157,418	Yes	82.50 Requirement (DAC)
													Project Area Type
37 E Evelyn Phase I	Affirmed Housing Group, Inc.	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Mountain View	161	1	59 \$	35,000,000	\$358,000	\$14,378,790	\$49,736,790	44,132	No	82.50 Goal (ICP)
Ontario Affordable Housing Phase II	National Community Renaissance of California; City of Ontario	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Ontario	144	1	43 \$	20,968,594	\$833,880	\$9,000,649	\$30,803,123	7,893	Yes	Project Area Type 81.00 Goal (ICP)
													Priority Population
143 Soto Apartments	East LA Community Corporation	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Los Angeles	138	1:	36 \$	35,000,000	\$802,512	\$11,096,800	\$46,899,312	16,608	Yes	78.50 Requirement (DAC)
	The Related Companies of California; La												Priority Population
Alveare Terrace	Cienega LOMOD, Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Los Angeles	100		99 \$	32,490,745	\$406,920	\$14,593,031	\$47,490,696	95,109	Yes	78.00 Requirement (DAC)
Freasure Island IC 4.3	John Stewart Company; Treasure Island Development Authority; Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	San Francisco	150	1	19 \$	33,500,000	\$664,140	\$10,945,000	\$45,109,140	13,674	Yes	Project Area Type 78.00 Goal (ICP)
	, , ,	, , , ,											Geographic Goal (Sa
401 Imperial Apartments*	S.V.D.P. Management, Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	San Diego	164	1	62 \$	35,000,000	\$933,200	\$13,864,557	\$49,797,757	16,589	Yes	75.00 Diego)
	Cesar Chavez Foundation; Vista del Monte												Project Area Type
Ith and Walnut Apartments	Affordable Apartments, Inc.	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Arvin	51		50 \$	14,470,000	\$522,000	\$7,370,102	\$22,362,102	9,741	Yes	74.50 Goal (RIPA)
	MidPen Housing Corporation; City of Watsonville; Santa Cruz Metropolitan					·							Geographic Goal
Vatsonville Metro	Transportation District	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Watsonville	79		78	\$29,380,604	\$532,520	\$9,095,000	\$39,008,124	5,909	Yes	73.16 (Central Coast)
													Project Area Type
ilver Peaks	Visionary Home Builders of California, Inc.	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Bishop	60		59 \$	16,864,836	\$150,000	\$9,447,846	\$26,462,682	10,021	No	69.50 Goal (RIPA)
	Rural Communities Housing Development												Project Area Type
Sunset Heights - Parcel 1	Corporation (RCHDC); City of Eureka	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Eureka	44		43 \$	13,068,713	\$684,100	\$8,032,222	\$21,785,035	3,472	No	68.00 Goal (RIPA)
Park Lane Homes*	Abode Communities; City of Desert Hot Springs	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Desert Hot Springs	87	;	86 \$	24,630,370	\$408,516	\$11,262,600	\$36,301,486	5 7,735	No	Project Area Type 67.50 Goal (RIPA)
												53.29% awards	
		TOTAL	47 to other disease	2			F74 222 F25	442 424 222		400F 246 555			
		TOTAL	17 Jurisdictions	2,578	2,51	φ >	571,223,786	\$13,424,869	\$250,669,553	\$835,318,208	897,771	in DAC	

^{*} Funding request reduced due to ineligible costs identified during project review Note: Applicant names have been updated to match the eligible entity name

Table 2. Projects not recommended for Award

	Angline	D	Product barballaria	-	Re	ome stricted		Programs	Transportation	Total AHSC Funds	Total Estimated AHSC GHG Emission Reductions	Community	
Project Name	Applicants	Project Area Type	Project Jurisdiction	Total Units	Un	its Ho	ousing Funding	Funding	Funding	Requested	(MTCO2e)	(DAC)	Final Score
	The Related Companies of California, LLC;												
	City of El Cerrito	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	El Cerrito		84	83	\$29,000,000	\$879,474	\$12,483,355	\$42,362,829	33,806	No	85
	BRIDGE Housing Corporation	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	South San Francisco		158	157	\$31,297,026	\$973,032	\$9,623,342	\$41,893,400	9,398	No	82.50
	Pacific West Communities, Inc., City of San		South Sun Francisco		150	137	\$52,237,626	ψ373,03 <u>2</u>	ψ3,023,3 ·2	\$ 11,030,100	3,550	110	02.50
	Leandro	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	San Leandro		481	476	\$35,000,000	\$1,749,680	\$9,039,100	\$45,788,780	21,864	No	77.83
	The Related Companies of California, LLC;												
	City of Dublin; Affordable Housing Access,												
Amador Station Phase 1	Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Dublin		86	85	\$29,300,000	\$892,232	\$12,457,318	\$42,649,550	30,626	No	77.33
The Crescent	Heritage Housing Partners, City of Napa	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Napa		77	77	\$18,500,204	\$535,620	\$9,783,658	\$28,819,482	18,615	No	76.66
Hayward Parcel Group 8	Resources for Community Development	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Hayward and Castro Valley		89	88	\$32,111,694	\$381,204	\$9,745,200	\$42,238,098	11,873	No	76.66
North Doubolou DADT Lot D	East Bay Asian Local Development	Torreit Oriented Development (TOD)	Dardrelen		60	F0	¢20.040.276	¢726 272	644.070.240	¢25 652 067	20 572	NI -	76.22
-	Corporation	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Berkeley		60	59	\$20,848,376	\$726,373	\$14,078,318	\$35,653,067	29,573	No	76.33
	Las Palmas Housing and Development Corporation; Stowell Villas, LLC;	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Upland		93	92	\$19,495,705	\$740,213	\$12,002,776	\$32,238,694	9,214	No	76
	Century Affordable Development, Inc.; One	integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Оріани		33	92	\$19,493,703	3740,213	\$12,002,770	\$32,236,034	3,214	INU	76
	San Pedro Collaborative, LLC; Richman OSP												
	Phase GP, LLC	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	San Pedro		144	136	\$31,364,068	\$972,360	\$10,092,691	\$42,429,119	9,923	Yes	72
	Pacific West Communities, Inc.; Contra						+	40.2,000	+ = 0,000 = ,000 =	Ţ := / := 0 /==0	0,0=0		
	Costa County; Eastern Contra Costa Transit												
	Authority	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Bay Point		169	167	\$30,000,000	\$692,684	\$9,527,838	\$40,220,522	11,682	No	71.50
Beyer Boulevard Trolley Village	Affirmed Housing Group, Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	San Ysidro		100	99	\$24,155,075	\$900,320	\$13,000,000	\$38,055,395	13,362	Yes	70.50
	Chelsea Investment Corporation; Pacific												
	Southwest Community Development												
	Corporation	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Sacramento		66	65	\$14,752,000	\$429,000	\$14,044,250	\$29,225,250	28,180		70
	PATH Ventures; Bold Communities	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Los Angeles		122	120 \$	33,300,000	\$663,632	\$13,313,600	\$47,277,232	23,774	No	69.66
	CRCD Partners, LLC; Special Service for	T (10)			70		400 004 700	4500.040	444450005	427.224.524		.,	50.50
	Groups, Inc.	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Los Angeles		70 49	69 48	\$22,294,720	\$538,848	\$14,460,936	\$37,294,504	11,151	Yes	68.50
	Many Mansions Self-Help Enterprises; Blue Ocean America	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Fillmore		49	48	\$13,400,000	\$528,900	\$7,526,152	\$21,455,052	1,023	No	67
	Community Development	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Fresno		118	116	\$34,294,128	\$249,000	\$2,908,922	\$37,452,050	3,072	Yes	62
	Self-Help Enterprises	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Chowchilla		80	79	\$15,000,000			\$22,790,347	5,459		61.50
	The Related Companies of California; City	narai iiiiovation i roject Area (nii A)	CHOWCHING		00	,,	\$15,000,000	Ş+03,200	\$1,525,141	Ç22,730,347	3,433	140	01.50
	of South Lake Tahoe	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	South Lake Tahoe		60	60	\$15,300,000	\$350,000	\$7,300,000	\$22,950,000	4,993	No	61
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					, ,,,,,,,	, ,	. ,,	, ,,			
The Roos @ Fulton Forum	Housing Authority of the City of Fresno	Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	Fresno		124	123	\$33,898,088	\$510,704	\$11,282,336	\$45,691,128	9,686	Yes	59.33
											5,809		
73rd Street Apartments*	Eden Housing, Inc.	Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)	San Diego		120	119	\$20,114,752	\$778,400	\$1,445,000	\$22,338,152	5,809	No	57
	Pacific West Communities, Inc.; City of												
Blossom Pointe Apartments	Fowler; Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Fowler		116	115	\$20,000,000	\$730,704	\$9,160,681	\$29,891,385	2,886	Yes	56.50
		T '' O ' ' I D I ' ' (TOD)			450	457	445 000 000	4455.000	47.005.447	400 700 047	97,215		
Hamilton Apartments	BRIDGE Housing Corporation	Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)	South San Francisco		158	157	\$15,000,000	\$465,200	\$7,325,147	\$22,790,347	<u> </u>	No	55.50
	Motropolitan Area Advisory Committee an												
	Metropolitan Area Advisory Committee on Anti-Poverty of San Diego County, Inc.	Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)	Escondido		180	178	\$35,000,000	\$807,390	\$1,270,000	\$37,077,390	11,984	No	53.50
	Willow Partners LLC; City of Huron; Fresno	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	Escolluluu		100	1/0	J33,000,000	3007,390	\$1,270,000	337,077,390	11,984	INU	33.30
	County Rural Transit Agency	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Huron		86	84	\$12,000,000	\$592,820	\$7,210,900	\$19,803,720	1,351	Yes	51.50
	Pacific West Communities, Inc.; City of Live					<u> </u>	\$12,000,000	Ç332,020	Ç.,E10,500	Q13,003,720	1,331		52.50
	Oak	Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	Live Oak		60	59	\$12,000,000	\$392,480	\$3,994,600	\$16,387,080	1,859	No	48.50
* Funding request reduced due to in	neligible costs identified during project revie						, , , , , , , , , , , ,		. , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,		

 $[\]ensuremath{^{*}}$ Funding request reduced due to ineligible costs identified during project review

Note: Applicant names have been updated to match the eligible entity name

Table 3. Applications that withdrew, failed threshold review, or were deemed ineligible

Project Name	Applicants	Project Location	Project Type	Issue(s)	AHSC Funds Requested
				Failed Threshold, incomplete application. Submitted AHSC application	
Moody Ridge Fire-Resilient Sustainable	Catalyst 123 LLC	Not provided by applicant	Not provided by applicant.	workbook was blank, as a result there is not enough information.	Not provided by applicant.