



Date: July 17, 2002
To: Inter-Regional Partnership Members
From: IRP Staff
RE: Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone Designation

Background

On May 15, 2002, the Inter-Regional Partnership approved the Evaluation Committee’s recommendation to designate as Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones the number one and two ranked projects in Alameda County, Dublin Transit Center and San Lorenzo Village. The IRP, on recommendation of the Evaluation Committee, did not designate Morgan Hill for the second Zone in Santa Clara County. The IRP’s decision was based on the majority opinion that the Morgan Hill application for a Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone failed to meet the minimum requirements set forth by the IRP and formalized in California statute. This decision left the IRP with one additional Zone that could be designated in any one of the IRP counties, assuming there would be ten Zones as called for in the enabling legislation.

According to the IRP State Pilot Program statute, a maximum of ten Zones may be designated in the IRP area. Including the two Zones designated on May 15th, nine Zones have been designated by the IRP. The IRP is interested in having a total of ten Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones throughout the IRP region. By maximizing the number of Zones allowed by the IRP Pilot Program statute, the IRP expects to have the greatest impact on the existing jobs/housing imbalance in the five county area. To designate the tenth Zone, the IRP voted to allow all third place Zones, from the first and second round RFP releases to compete against each other for the tenth Zone.

Discussion

On June 17, 2002, the Evaluation Committee of the IRP met to review all third-place applications. The evaluation was done using procedures and scoring criteria established through each previous RFP evaluation. The following table lists the top three Zones in each county, as applicable. The top two have received Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone status.

Table 1. Designated Zones (1st and 2nd Ranked) and 3rd Ranked Zones

Proposal	Committee Ranking
Alameda County	
Dublin Transit Center	1
San Lorenzo Village	2
Union City Intermodal Station Area	3
Contra Costa County	
Cities of Antioch & Brentwood	1
Cities of Antioch & Oakley	2
City of Pittsburg	3
Santa Clara County	
City of Milpitas	1

San Joaquin County	
City of Tracy: <i>Tracy Gateway Business Park</i>	1
County of San Joaquin: <i>Airport East</i>	2
City of Manteca: <i>Tara Business Park</i>	3
Stanislaus County	
County of Stanislaus (Patterson)	1
City of Modesto	2
County of Stanislaus (Salida)	3

The Evaluation Committee was made up of five IRP members, one from each IRP county:

- Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy, San Joaquin County
- Mayor Richard Dodds, City of Patterson, Stanislaus County
- Council Member Millie Greenberg, City of Danville, Contra Costa County
- Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County
- Council Member Linda LeZotte, City of San Jose, Santa Clara County

Before the Evaluation Committee met, the proposals were reviewed for completeness and staff performed the GIS evaluation. A packet was then sent to each member that included the following materials:

- A summary of the zone proposal.
- A blank score sheet available for Evaluation Committee members to use during the review and scoring process. (Note: the GIS section was completed for each proposal by staff based on the IRP adopted GIS scoring system.)
- A copy of the proposal submitted to the IRP.

Table 2 contains the average of the individual scores each proposal received by the Evaluation Committee members. A ranking has been provided based on these averages.

Table 2. Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone Evaluation Committee Scoring

Proposal	Average Score	Evaluation Committee Ranking
Alameda County		
Union City	107.0	1
San Joaquin County		
City of Manteca	103.3	2
Contra Costa County		
Contra Costa County/City of Pittsburg	92.1	3
Stanislaus County		
Stanislaus County	91.3	4

The above scores have been forwarded to all Jobs/Housing Zone applicants. The applicants have been made aware of this IRP meeting and may be interested in addressing the IRP. The City of Union City, in particular, has expressed an interest in addressing the IRP, prior to the IRP making its final selection.

Requested Action

Staff requests that the IRP members discuss the Evaluation Committee's ranking of proposed Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones and consider designating the tenth Zone in the IRP region.