

**SGIP Cycle 6
Planning Projects Evaluation Workbook**

Planning Evaluation Workbook - Application Index

Application ID	Applicant Name	Contact Name	Project Title	Brief Project Summary	SGIP Grant Request Amount	Total Matching Funds Provided	Total Project Cost
COR-1	Coronado	Tricia Olsen	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Needs Assessment & Master Plan	Development of a Request for Proposals to secure a consultant to conduct the Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Needs Assessment and Master Plan.	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
LM-2	La Mesa	Laura Traffenstedt	La Mesa Downtown Village Specific Plan	Comprehensive community update to the Downtown Village Specific Plan	\$ 372,289	\$ 33,339	\$ 405,628
LG-2	Lemon Grove	Lydia Romero	Lemon Grove Massachusetts Avenue Safe Routes to Transit Connectivity Plan	Transformative urban mobility initiative aimed at enhancing first-last mile connectivity, fostering transit oriented development housing and revitalizing key transit hubs.	\$ 463,067	\$ 1,000	\$ 464,067
LG-3	Lemon Grove	Izzy Murguia	Lemon Grove Regional Bikeway Corridor Study	Complete a corridor study to evaluate the feasibility of implementing a regional bikeway with innovative intersections and safety enhancements	\$ 632,500	\$ 1,000	\$ 633,500
OC-1	Oceanside	Kristopher Martinez	Oceanside Active Transportation Plan	Improve non-motorized access, comfort, safety, and connectivity to schools, parks, transit, and other community destinations.	\$ 584,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 650,000
SD-1	San Diego	Heidi Vonblum	Balboa Park Master Plan: Connecting Parks, People and Places	BPMP will serve as a comprehensive framework for transforming Balboa Park into a regional and local community asset.	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 251,000	\$ 1,251,000
SD-5	San Diego	Heidi Vonblum	Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan Update	Revise the land use map and update policies	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 250,157	\$ 1,250,157
SD-6	San Diego	Heidi Vonblum	Rancho Bernardo Community Plan Update	Revise the land use map and support policies to increase opportunity for homes and jobs near transit and employment centers	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 250,157	\$ 1,250,157
VS-1	Vista	Husam Hasenin	City of Vista Active Transportation Plan	Identify needs and gaps in the transportation network, prioritize active transportation infrastructure and program recommendations.	\$ 407,900	\$ 451,825	\$ 859,725
CNTY-1	County	Alexa Kerr	Buena Creek Specific Plan	Advance smart growth, support housing production, and coordinate infrastructure investment	\$ 751,500	\$ 241,500	\$ 993,000
EL-2	El Cajon	Noah Alvey	Mixed Use Overlay	The project proposes to establish increased housing capacity through a new walkable district in an existing commercial area. The project will expand the Mixed-Use Overlay Zone, which was approved in 2018, and provide an urban framework that allows a mix of uses, building and housing types. The project will include rezoning of properties within the new district and additional California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis based on the previously approved Program Environmental Impact Report for the Mixed-Use Overlay Zone.	\$ 500,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 551,000
EL-4	El Cajon	Michael Vigilione	Parkway Specific Plan	The project proposes to create a comprehensive planning document for the Parkway Plaza shopping center linking to the Arnele Avenue Transit Station and its immediately adjacent high density parcels within the Mixed-Use Overlay zone. The document will plan the economic revitalization of Parkway Plaza, accommodate previously approved housing capacity, provide enhanced pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, modernize the bus transfer station, and plan for Arnele Avenue roadway improvements from Johnson to Marshall Avenues and reconcile the varying regulatory standards that exist between the Specific Plan, Zoning, and Mixed-Use Overlay.	\$ 650,000	\$ 151,000	\$ 801,000
ES-1	Escondido	Matthew Anderson	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	Establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) to assist in the delivery of affordable housing within the Plan Area. The AHTF should be used to provide affordable housing for lower and middle income households. The AHTF can be used to augment State and Federal programs to expand affordable housing opportunities for these under-served groups	\$ 315,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 381,000
NC-4	National City	Stephen Manganiello	National City Downtown Specific Plan Update	Perform comprehensive review and update to the DSP with emphasis on community and stakeholder engagement; smart growth development principles, design guidelines and incentives; sustainable communities strategies; housing and mobility choices; safety enhancements in support of Vision Zero; parking management; and expedited development review process	\$ 500,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 626,000
NC-6	National City	Luca Zappiello	Housing Supportive Infrastructure Assessment	Infrastructure assessments of the existing sewer, storm drain, lighting, pedestrian facilities (sidewalks, ADA, pedestrian crossings), and roads in areas recently rezoned in National City to allow for residential or mixed-use buildings up to 250 feet.	\$ 599,000	\$ 151,000	\$ 750,000
SM-2	San Marcos	Stephanie Kellar	San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Plan	Transportation Corridor Study for San Marcos Blvd. will review existing conditions and define future smart growth roadway conditions used by vehicles, bicycles, transit, and pedestrians to create a welcoming environment the community supports and utilizes.	\$ 782,175	\$ 138,175	\$ 920,350
					\$ 9,707,431	\$ 2,229,153	\$ 11,936,584

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn by the City on July 1, 2025.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - Evaluator Scores (1)

SGIP Evaluator # 1 Score Sheet

Evaluator Instructions:

Step 1: Review the SGIP Cycle 6 Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Rubric included in your Evaluator Packet.

Step 2: Score each project application's qualitative responses (non-blacked out box) using the Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Rubric. While most qualitative responses can be found in the Project Narrative section of the Project Application, others can be found in the Project Scope of Work and other application materials. SANDAG staff will score the quantitative (blacked-out columns) responses against the quantitative evaluation criteria, which vary based on project type. To score the qualitative responses, select a number from the drop-down menu which corresponds to the options in the scoring rubric. Do not select a zero unless a response to a criterion is missing or is so incomplete or incoherent that you cannot reasonably understand or infer the meaning of the response. The Total Evaluator Score per project will auto populate.

Step 3: Provide scores for Planning Projects Evaluation Criteria table below

Step 2: Score Project Applications

Application ID	Project Title	Evaluation Criteria												Total Evaluator Score
		1	2			3		4		5		6		
			A.		B.		C.		A.	B.	A.	B.	A.	
		Up to 10 points	i. Up to 2 points	ii. Up to 7 points	i. Up to 2 points	ii. Up to 3 points	i. Up to 2 points	ii. Up to 3 points	Up to 10 points	Up to 5 points	Up to 15 points	Up to 10 points	Up to 12.5 points	
COR-1	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Needs Assessment & Master Plan		4				1		3	6	2			16
LM-2	La Mesa Downtown Village Specific Plan		5				3		4	13	8			33
LG-2	Lemon Grove Massachusetts Avenue Safe Routes to Transit Connectivity Plan		7				3		5	14	9			38
LG-3	Lemon Grove Regional Bikeway Corridor Study		6				3		5	12	9			35
OC-1	Oceanside Active Transportation Plan													0
SD-1	Balboa Park Master Plan: Connecting Parks, People and Places		7				3		5	14	9			38
SD-5	Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan Update		6				3		5	14	9			37
SD-6	Rancho Bernardo Community Plan Update		6				3		5	14	9			37
VS-1	City of Vista Active Transportation Plan		7				3		5	14	9			38
CNTY-1	Buena Creek Specific Plan		6				3		5	12	9			35
EL-2	Mixed Use Overlay		6				3		5	13	9			36
EL-4	Parkway Specific Plan		6				3		4	12	8			33
ES-1	Affordable Housing Trust Fund		4				3		3	7	2			19
NC-4	National City Downtown Specific Plan Update		6				3		5	13	9			36
NC-6	Housing Supportive Infrastructure Assessment		6				3		5	11	9			34
SM-2	San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Plan		5				3		4	10	7			29

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn by the City on July 1, 2025.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - Evaluator Scores (E2)

SGIP Evaluator # 2 Score Sheet

Evaluator Instructions:

Step 1: Review the SGIP Cycle 6 Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Rubric included in your Evaluator Packet.

Step 2: Score each project application's qualitative responses (non-blacked out box) using the Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Rubric. While most qualitative responses can be found in the Project Narrative section of the Project Application, others can be found in the Project Scope of Work and other application materials. SANDAG staff will score the quantitative (blacked-out columns) responses against the quantitative evaluation criteria, which vary based on project type. To score the qualitative responses, select a number from the drop-down menu which corresponds to the options in the scoring rubric. Do not select a zero unless a response to a criterion is missing or is so incomplete or incoherent that you cannot reasonably understand or infer the meaning of the response. The Total Evaluator Score per project will auto populate.

Step 3: Provide scores for Planning Projects Evaluation Criteria table below

Step 2: Score Project Applications

Application ID	Project Title	Evaluation Criteria												Total Evaluator Score
		1	2			3		4		5		6		
		Up to 10 points	A.		B.		C.		A.	B.	A.	B.	A.	
			i.	ii.	i.	ii.	i.	ii.	Up to 10 points	Up to 5 points	Up to 15 points	Up to 10 points	Up to 12.5 points	
COR-1	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Needs Assessment & Master Plan		4			0		3	5	4				16
LM-2	La Mesa Downtown Village Specific Plan		5			3		4	15	8				35
LG-2	Lemon Grove Massachusetts Avenue Safe Routes to Transit Connectivity Plan		6			3		4	13	9				35
LG-3	Lemon Grove Regional Bikeway Corridor Study		7			3		4	15	8				37
OC-1	Oceanside Active Transportation Plan													0
SD-1	Balboa Park Master Plan: Connecting Parks, People and Places		7			3		5	14	8				37
SD-5	Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan Update		6			3		4	12	9				34
SD-6	Rancho Bernardo Community Plan Update		6			1		4	12	9				32
VS-1	City of Vista Active Transportation Plan		7			3		5	15	10				40
CNTY-1	Buena Creek Specific Plan		7			3		4	14	10				38
EL-2	Mixed Use Overlay		5			3		4	13	7				32
EL-4	Parkway Specific Plan		6			3		4	13	7				33
ES-1	Affordable Housing Trust Fund		5			3		4	12	6				30
NC-4	National City Downtown Specific Plan Update		6			3		4	14	8				35
NC-6	Housing Supportive Infrastructure Assessment		6			3		4	13	8				34
SM-2	San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Plan		7			3		5	14	9				38

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn by the City on July 1, 2025.

Note: A zero (0) was given for Evaluation Criteria 2C.ii because the project is not located within a DAC.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - Evaluator Scores (E3)

SGIP Evaluator #3 Score Sheet

Evaluator Instructions:

Step 1: Review the SGIP Cycle 6 Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Rubric included in your Evaluator Packet.

Step 2: Score each project application's qualitative responses (non-blacked out box) using the Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Rubric. While most qualitative responses can be found in the Project Narrative section of the Project Application, others can be found in the Project Scope of Work and other application materials. SANDAG staff will score the quantitative (blacked-out columns) responses against the quantitative evaluation criteria, which vary based on project type. To score the qualitative responses, select a number from the drop-down menu which corresponds to the options in the scoring rubric. Do not select a zero unless a response to a criterion is missing or is so incomplete or incoherent that you cannot reasonably understand or infer the meaning of the response. The Total Evaluator Score per project will auto populate.

Step 3: Provide scores for Planning Projects Evaluation Criteria table below

Step 2: Score Project Applications

Application ID	Project Title	Evaluation Criteria												Total Evaluator Score
		1	2			3		4		5		6		
		Up to 10 points	A.		B.		C.		A.	B.	A.	B.	A.	
			i.	ii.	i.	ii.	i.	ii.	Up to 10 points	Up to 5 points	Up to 15 points	Up to 10 points	Up to 12.5 points	
COR-1	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Needs Assessment & Master Plan		5				3		3	10	7			28
LM-2	La Mesa Downtown Village Specific Plan		6				3		5	13	8			35
LG-2	Lemon Grove Massachusetts Avenue Safe Routes to Transit Connectivity Plan		6				3		5	14	9			37
LG-3	Lemon Grove Regional Bikeway Corridor Study		6				3		5	14	9			37
OC-1	Oceanside Active Transportation Plan													0
SD-1	Balboa Park Master Plan: Connecting Parks, People and Places		4				1		3	10	7			25
SD-5	Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan Update		6				3		4	11	8			32
SD-6	Rancho Bernardo Community Plan Update		4				1		3	9	7			24
VS-1	City of Vista Active Transportation Plan		5				3		4	9	7			28
CNTY-1	Buena Creek Specific Plan		5				1		3	8	6			23
EL-2	Mixed Use Overlay		5				3		5	12	9			34
EL-4	Parkway Specific Plan		5				3		5	12	9			34
ES-1	Affordable Housing Trust Fund		3				1		2	2	4			12
NC-4	National City Downtown Specific Plan Update		7				3		5	13	9			37
NC-6	Housing Supportive Infrastructure Assessment		5				3		5	13	9			35
SM-2	San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Plan		5				1		4	11	8			29

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn by the City on July 1, 2025.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - BP33

PART A - PROHOUSING POLICIES

Application ID	Prohousing Designation*		
	Prohousing Designation	Count "Yes"	Points Earned
COR-1	No	0	0
LM-2	No	0	0
LG-2	No	0	0
LG-3	No	0	0
OC-1	No	0	0
SD-1	Yes	1	12.5
SD-5	Yes	1	12.5
SD-6	Yes	1	12.5
VS-1	No	0	0
CNTY-1	Yes	1	12.5
EL-2	No	0	0
EL-4	No	0	0
ES-1	No	0	0
NC-4	No	0	0
NC-6	No	0	0
SM-2	No	0	0

Cells in yellow indicate places where data needs to be filled in.
Cells in white indicate places where data is populated by a formula or VLOOKUP.

*For Categories 1-4 below, applicants with a ProHousing Designation received a "No" under each ProHousing Policy Category because they already received the full points for this criteria by having the ProHousing Designation.

Application ID	Category 1: Favorable Zoning and Land Use Policies															Total Points Earned (Max 5 points)
	Policies worth 5 points each						Policies worth 2.5 points each									
	Housing element plan for zoned capacity of >150% of RHNA	Permitting missing middle uses (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhomes) in existing low-density single-family zones	Eliminating minimum parking requirements	Allowing residential in commercial zones	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Allowing more/larger accessory dwelling units (ADUs) than state law requires	Density bonus that is >10% more than state requirements	Established Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone (WHOOZ) or housing sustainability district	Standards to promote more density	Housing element plan for zoned capacity of >125% of RHNA	Reduced parking requirements	Count "Yes"	Points Earned		
COR-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	5	
LM-2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	15	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	5	
LG-2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	3	15	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	5	
LG-3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	3	15	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	5	
OC-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-5	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-6	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
VS-1	No	Yes	No	Yes	2	10	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	2	5	5	
CNTY-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
EL-2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	15	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	10	5	
EL-4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	15	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	10	5	
ES-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	2	5	5	
NC-4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3	15	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	10	5	
NC-6	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3	15	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	10	5	
SM-2	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	1	2.5	2.5	

Cells in red text and highlight indicate that the grant application exceeded the maximum points earned in the subcategory.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - BP33

Application ID	Category 2: Acceleration of Housing Production Timeframes																Total Points Earned (Max 5 points)
	Policies worth 5 points each							Policies worth 2.5 points each									
	Ministerial approval of housing	Streamlined/program-level California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for general plans/specific plans etc.	Permit process that is less than two months	Elimination of public hearings for projects consistent with zoning/general plan	One-stop shop permitting processes or single point of contact	Priority permit processing or reduced plan check times for ADUs/junior ADUs, multifamily, or affordable housing	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Streamlined housing development at the project level	Permit process that is less than four months	Three public hearings limit for projects consistent with zoning/general plan	Eliminated or replaced subjective design standards with objective standards that simplify zoning	Standard entitlement application	Publicly posting online status updates on permit approvals	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	
COR-1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	3	15	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	2.5	5
LM-2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	1	5	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	5
LG-2	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	3	15	No	Yes	No	No	No	1	2.5	5	
LG-3	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	3	15	No	Yes	No	No	No	1	2.5	5	
OC-1	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-1	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-5	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-6	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
VS-1	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	3	15	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	3	7.5	5
CNTY-1	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
EL-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6	30	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	12.5	5
EL-4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6	30	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	12.5	5
ES-1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	2	10	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	1	2.5	5
NC-4	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	4	20	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	4	10	5
NC-6	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	4	20	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	4	10	5
SM-2	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	15	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	5

Cells in red text and highlight indicate that the grant application exceeded the maximum points earned in the subcategory.

Application ID	Category 3: Reduction of Construction and Development Costs													Total Points Earned (Max 5 points)
	Policies worth 5 points each				Policies worth 2.5 points each									
	Waived development impact fees for housing	Adopted universal design ordinances	Preapproved prototype plans for missing middle housing (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, townhomes)	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Measures that reduce costs for transportation-related infrastructure or that encourage active transit or other alternatives to cars	Reduced development impact fees for housing	Less restrictive ADU standards than state requirements	Fee reduction, including deferrals or reduced fees for housing with people with special needs	Promoting innovative housing types that reduced development costs	Count "Yes"	Points Earned		
COR-1	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
LM-2	Yes	No	No	1	5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	3	7.5	5	
LG-2	No	No	Yes	1	5	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	2	5	5	
LG-3	No	No	Yes	1	5	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	2	5	5	
OC-1	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-1	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-5	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
SD-6	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
VS-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	15	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	5	
CNTY-1	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	
EL-2	Yes	Yes	No	2	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	4	10	5	
EL-4	Yes	Yes	No	2	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	4	10	5	
ES-1	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	Yes	No	No	1	2.5	2.5	
NC-4	Yes	Yes	No	2	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	4	10	5	
NC-6	Yes	Yes	No	2	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	4	10	12.5	
SM-2	No	No	No	0	0	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	2.5	2.5	

Cells in red text and highlight indicate that the grant application exceeded the maximum points earned in the subcategory.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - BP33

Application ID	Category 4: Providing Financial Subsidies											
	Policies worth 5 points each						Policies worth 2.5 points each					
	Local housing trust fund or collaboration on regional fund	Program to comply with Surplus Lands Act and make publicly owned land available for affordable housing	Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD)	Prioritization of local general funds for affordable housing	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Grants/low-interest loans for affordable ADUs	Direct residual redevelopment funds to affordable housing	Development and regular use of housing subsidy pool, local/regional trust, or similar funding source	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Total Points Earned (Max 5 points)
COR-1	No	Yes	No	No	1	5	No	No	No	0	0	5
LM-2	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
LG-2	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	10	No	No	No	0	0	5
LG-3	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	10	No	No	No	0	0	5
OC-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
SD-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
SD-5	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
SD-6	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
VS-1	No	Yes	No	Yes	2	10	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	5
CNTY-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
EL-2	No	Yes	No	No	1	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	5
EL-4	No	Yes	No	No	1	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	5
ES-1	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
NC-4	No	Yes	No	No	1	5	Yes	Yes	No	2	5	5
NC-6	No	Yes	No	No	1	5	Yes	Yes	No	2	5	5
SM-2	No	Yes	No	No	1	5	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	5

Cells in red text and highlight indicate that the grant application exceeded the maximum points earned in the subcategory.

VLOOKUP PART A - PROHOUSING POLICIES

Application ID	Prohousing Designation	Category 1: Favorable Zoning and Land Use Policies	Category 2: Acceleration of Housing Production Timeframes	Category 3: Reduction of Construction and Development Costs	Category 4: Providing Financial Subsidies	Total Points Earned (Max 12.5 Points)
COR-1	0	5	5	0	5	12.5
LM-2	0	5	5	5	0	12.5
LG-2	0	5	5	5	5	12.5
LG-3	0	5	5	5	5	12.5
OC-1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-1	12.5	0	0	0	0	12.5
SD-5	12.5	0	0	0	0	12.5
SD-6	12.5	0	0	0	0	12.5
VS-1	0	5	5	5	5	12.5
CNTY-1	12.5	0	0	0	0	12.5
EL-2	0	5	5	5	5	12.5
EL-4	0	5	5	5	5	12.5
ES-1	0	5	5	2.5	0	12.5
NC-4	0	5	5	5	5	12.5
NC-6	0	5	5	12.5	5	12.5
SM-2	0	2.5	5	2.5	5	12.5

Planning Evaluation Workbook - BP33

PART B - HOUSING EQUITY/AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

Application ID	Housing Equity															Total Points Earned (Max 12.5 points)
	Policies worth 5 points each								Policies worth 2.5 points each							
	An adopted inclusionary housing ordinance	Rent stabilization policies (townhomes) in existing low-density single-family zones	Anti-displacement policies in conjunction with transit improvements	Strategies or funds to preserve naturally occurring affordable housing	Tenant protection policies such as access to counsel, just cause eviction policy, etc.	Rezoning and other policies that result in a net gain of low- and moderate-income housing while concurrently mitigating development impacts on or from environmentally sensitive or hazardous areas.	Programs, and land use plans and policies that are intended to result in increased investment (such as infrastructure, housing, open space, etc.) in lower opportunity areas.	Zone changes or other policies (other than those listed above) that increase low and moderate-income housing and affordability in High Resource and Highest Opportunity areas, as designated in the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps.	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Displacement risk studies	Publicly available database of affordable housing properties at risk of losing affordability restrictions through the expiration of rent restrictions or tenant voucher programs	Proactive monitoring of housing at risk of losing affordability restrictions and proactive enforcement of state-mandated tenant notification	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	
COR-1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1	5	No	Yes	No	1	2.5	7.5
LM-2	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	2	10	No	No	No	0	0	10
LG-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	5	25	Yes	No	Yes	2	5	12.5
LG-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	5	25	Yes	No	Yes	2	5	12.5
OC-1	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	0	0	0
SD-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	40	No	No	Yes	1	2.5	12.5
SD-5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	40	No	No	Yes	1	2.5	12.5
SD-6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	40	No	No	Yes	1	2.5	12.5
VS-1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	4	20	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	7.5	12.5
CNTY-1	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	3	15	No	No	No	0	0	12.5
EL-2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	2	10	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	12.5
EL-4	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	2	10	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	12.5
ES-1	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	3	15	No	No	Yes	1	2.5	12.5
NC-4	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	3	15	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	12.5
NC-6	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	3	15	No	Yes	Yes	2	5	12.5
SM-2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1	5	Yes	No	No	1	2.5	7.5

Cells in red text and highlight indicate that the grant application exceeded the maximum points earned in the subcategory.

VLOOKUP TOTAL BP 33 SCORE

Application ID	Total BP 33 Score
COR-1	20
LM-2	22.5
LG-2	25
LG-3	25
OC-1	0
SD-1	25
SD-5	25
SD-6	25
VS-1	25
CNTY-1	25
EL-2	25
EL-4	25
ES-1	25
NC-4	25
NC-6	25
SM-2	20

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn by the City on July 1, 2025.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - Smart Growth Activities

CRITERIA 3
PART A - SMART GROWTH ACTIVITIES

Application ID	Increasing density within a Transit Priority Area (TPA)	Planning Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zones with incentives for affordable housing	Creating Smart Growth & Housing Overlay Zones	Establishing density minimums	Develop Smart Growth Design Guidelines	Developing Smart Growth Street Design Standards to promote walking and multimodal transit options.	Creating zoning districts that allow mixed-use, mixed-income development by right	Design guidelines to promote street-oriented buildings, with reduced or eliminated setbacks, building heights at least 50% of the street width, and locating vehicle entrances behind or on the sides of buildings.	Modify development standards to promote more density	Walkability or Bike Plans that include design improvements to the public realm	Developing a comprehensive active transportation plan citywide, or within a targeted transit-rich neighborhood	Implementing Vision Zero plan city-wide	The project will offer people access to shared, on-demand transportation services that provide convenient and personalized travel options	Measures that reduce costs for transportation-related infrastructure or that encourage active transit or other alternatives to cars	Increasing transportation options	The project will create a highly connected street grid network where all adjacent roads are connected to the internal street network and provide for future connection with adjacent properties.	Plan to provide amenities to improve mobility	The project includes plans to minimize the impacts of climate change	Count "Yes"	Points Earned	Total Points Earned (Max 10 points)
COR-1	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1	2	2
LM-2	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	9	18	10
LG-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	15	30	10
LG-3	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	5	10	10
OC-1	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0
SD-1	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7	14	10
SD-5	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	5	10	10
SD-6	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	5	10	10
VS-1	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	10	20	10
CNTY-1	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	9	18	10
EL-2	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	8	16	10
EL-4	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	12	24	10
ES-1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2	4	4
NC-4	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8	16	10
NC-6	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	6	12	10
SM-2	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7	14	10

Cells in red text and highlight indicate that the grant application exceeded the maximum points earned in the subcategory.

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn by the City on July 1, 2025.

Planning Evaluation Workbook - Final Results

Available Funding: \$ 12,000,000

Application ID	Agency Name	Project Title	Qualitative Criteria (Evaluators)				Quantitative Criteria	Total Application	SGIP Grant Request	SGIP Funding Recommendation	Remaining Available Funding
			E1	E2	E3	Average Score					
NC-4	National City	National City Downtown Specific Plan Update	36.0	35.0	37.0	36.0	60.0	96.00	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 11,500,000
SD-5	San Diego	Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan Update	37.0	34.0	32.0	34.3	60.0	94.33	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 10,500,000
NC-6	National City	Housing Supportive Infrastructure Assessment	34.0	34.0	35.0	34.3	60.0	94.33	\$ 599,000	\$ 599,000	\$ 9,901,000
VS-1	Vista	City of Vista Active Transportation Plan	38.0	40.0	28.0	35.3	58.0	93.33	\$ 407,900	\$ 407,900	\$ 9,493,100
LG-2	Lemon Grove	Lemon Grove Massachusetts Avenue Safe Routes to Transit Connectivity Plan	38.0	35.0	37.0	36.7	56.0	92.67	\$ 463,067	\$ 463,067	\$ 9,030,033
LG-3	Lemon Grove	Lemon Grove Regional Bikeway Corridor Study	35.0	37.0	37.0	36.3	56.0	92.33	\$ 632,500	\$ 632,500	\$ 8,397,533
EL-4	El Cajon	Parkway Specific Plan	33.0	33.0	34.0	33.3	59.0	92.33	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 7,747,533
SD-1	San Diego	Balboa Park Master Plan: Connecting Parks, People and Places	38.0	37.0	25.0	33.3	58.0	91.33	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 6,747,533
EL-2	El Cajon	Mixed Use Overlay	36.0	32.0	34.0	34.0	57.0	91.00	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 6,247,533
SD-6	San Diego	Rancho Bernardo Community Plan Update	37.0	32.0	24.0	31.0	58.0	89.00	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,247,533
LM-2	La Mesa	La Mesa Downtown Village Specific Plan	33.0	35.0	35.0	34.3	54.5	88.83	\$ 372,289	\$ 372,289	\$ 4,875,244
CNTY-1	County	Buena Creek Specific Plan	35.0	38.0	23.0	32.0	55.0	87.00	\$ 751,500	\$ 751,500	\$ 4,123,744
SM-2	San Marcos	San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Plan	29.0	38.0	29.0	32.0	54.0	86.00	\$ 782,175	\$ 782,175	\$ 3,341,569
ES-1	Escondido	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	19.0	30.0	12.0	20.3	50.0	70.33	\$ 315,000	\$ 315,000	\$ 3,026,569
COR-1	Coronado	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Needs Assessment & Master Plan	16.0	16.0	28.0	20.0	37.0	57.00	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 2,876,569
OC-1	Oceanside	Oceanside Active Transportation Plan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	\$ 584,000	\$ -	\$ 2,876,569

Note: OC-1 The City of Oceanside's Active Transportation Plan Application was withdrawn on July 1, 2025.

\$ 9,123,431 \$ 9,123,431

Recommended for full funding

Note: \$2,876,569 remained after funding all of the applications. This amount was carried over to fund Capital projects.