Housing Advisory Commission

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
Thursday, May 5, 2016

Time: 7:00 p.m.

South Berkeley Senior Center
2939 Ellis Street – Berkeley
Secretary Amy Davidson, (510) 981-5406

AGENDA

All agenda items are for Discussion and Possible Action.

Public Comment Policy: *Members of the public may speak on any items on the Agenda and items not on the Agenda during the initial Public Comment period. Members of the public may also comment on any item listed on the agenda as the item is taken up. Members of the public may not speak more than once on any given item. The Chair may limit public comments to 3 minutes or less.*

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Approval
3. Public Comment
4. Approval of the April 7, 2016 Draft Meeting Minutes *(Attachment 1)*

UPDATES / ACTION ITEMS

5. **BRIDGE/BFHP Predevelopment, Site Control, and requirements for additional Tax Credits** – *Alejandro Soto-Vigil (Attachment 2)*
6. **Acton Courtyard Rent Overcharges** – *Igor Tregub (Attachment 3)*
7. **Berkeley Housing Retention Program** – *Alejandro Soto-Vigil (Attachment 4)*
8. **Subcommittee Reports**
    a. **Moderate Income Housing Strategies** – *Marian Wolfe (Attachment 5)*
9. **Update on Council Items** – *All/Staff*
    a. BHA – June 14
    b. Short Term Rental Regulations – May 10
    c. Housing Meeting – May 17
10. **Future Items – all items and dates are tentative**
    a. Smoke-free housing ordinance evaluation – July
11. **Announcements**
12. **Adjourn**

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft April 7, 2016 Meeting Minutes
2. BRIDGE/BFHP Predevelopment, Site Control, and requirements for additional Tax Credits
3. Acton Courtyard Rent Overcharges
4. Berkeley Housing Retention Program
5. Moderate Income Housing Subcommittee Draft Action Plan
6. Information: Marian Wolfe's Framework for Housing Proposals memo
7. Information: HAC Subcommittee Roster
8. Information: 4/25/2016 Alameda County Housing Bond presentation

Written material may be viewed in advance of the meeting at the Housing Department, 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor, during working hours.

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 981-6342 (V) or 981-6345 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.

Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the secretary to the relevant board, commission or committee for further information.

Housing Advisory Commission

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Thursday, April 7, 2016

Time: 7:06 p.m.

South Berkeley Senior Center
2939 Ellis Street – Berkeley
Secretary – Amy Davidson, (510) 981-5406

MINUTES

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1. **Roll Call**
   Present: Heidi Abramson, Diego Aguilar-Canabal, Tor Berg, Kathleen Crandall, Brendan Darrow, Jill Martinucci, Igor Tregub, and Marian Wolfe. Absent: Alejandro Soto-Vigil (excused).
   Commissioners in attendance: 8 of 8
   Staff Present: Davidson and Wyant
   Members of the public in attendance: 0
   Public Speakers: 0

2. **Agenda Approval**
   Action: M/S/C (Abramson/Crandall) to approve agenda.
   Vote: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

3. **Public Comment**
   Zero speakers

4. **Approval of March 3, 2016 Minutes**
   Action: M/S/C (Abramson/Crandall) to approve minutes with the correction of typos identified.
   Vote: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

UPDATES / ACTION ITEMS

5. **Debrief on April 5th City Council Meeting, including the Mayor's Housing Plan, Tiny House Programs, the Homeless Shelter Crisis, the Housing Trust Fund Guidelines, and Other Housing-Related Items**

6. **Discuss and Adopt HAC Work Plan and Form New Related Subcommittees**
   6a. Action: M/S/C (Wolfe/Tregub) to disband the Density Bonus Subcommittee and create two new subcommittees: one focusing on middle-income housing strategies (80 – 160% AMI), and one focusing on low- and very low-income housing strategies (<80% AMI). Both

subcommittees will meet to identify a more detailed work plan and present it to the entire HAC for approval. The term of each subcommittee will be one year (through March 2016).
Vote: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

6b. Action: M/S/C (Tregub/Darrow) to appoint to the Middle-Income Housing Strategies Subcommittee the following members: Abramson, Crandall, Martinucci, and Wolfe.
Vote: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused)

6c. Action: M/S/C (Darrow/Abramson) to appoint to the Low-Income Housing Strategies Subcommittee the following members: Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, and Tregub.
Vote: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

7. Recommendation to the City Council to Endorse Several State Legislative Items Related to Housing

Action: M/S/C (Wolfe/Tregub) to recommend that City Council endorse the following pending state legislation:

a. AB 2502 Vote: Ayes: Berg, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: Abramson. Abstain: Aguilar-Canabal and Crandall. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).
b. AB 2031 Vote: Ayes: Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: Abramson. Abstain: Aguilar-Canabal. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).
c. AB 2406 Vote: Ayes: Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: Abramson. Abstain: Aguilar-Canabal. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

8. Correspondence to the Commission on Aging Regarding Senior Homeless Needs

Action: M/S/C (Darrow/Martinucci) to add Commissioner Wolfe's name and approve the correspondence to the Commission on Aging.
Vote: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

9. Human Welfare and Community Action Commission, Request to Review Commission Process Improvement

10. Update on Council Items

11. Future Items

12. Announcements

13. Adjourn

Action: M/S/C (Tregub/Darrow) to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 p.m.
Votes: Ayes: Abramson, Aguilar-Canabal, Berg, Crandall, Darrow, Martinucci, Tregub, and Wolfe. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Soto-Vigil (excused).

Approved on DATE, 2016

_____, Amy Davidson, Secretary

To: Housing Advisory Commission

From: Chair Darrow and Commissioner Soto-Vigil

Date: Cinco de Mayo, 2016

Subject: BRIDGE/BFHP Predevelopment, Site Control, and requirements for additional Tax Credits

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Housing Advisory Commission recommend to the Berkeley City Council to act quickly to support the BRIDGE/BFHP Berkeley Way development project in its efforts to acquire site control, additional predevelopment funding and any other requirements necessary to apply for additional state tax credits that will become unavailable after June 14, 2016.

BACKGROUND:

The City Council first endorsed an affordable housing project in concept for the Berkeley Way parking lot in 2009. Over the last several year, the City has made significant movement forward to make this project a reality.

A regulatory change that will go into effect later this year will result in the Berkeley Way site losing this "Difficult to Develop Area" status, which currently enhances the feasibility of the project. If the project is awarded tax credits in the current cycle, the Difficult to Develop Area status could be worth approximately $5,000,000 of additional tax credit financing, which will reduce the City and County contribution gap.

In order to achieve this, the developers will need to submit application materials (demonstrating site control) to the State by June 14th. To make the application deadline Housing staff is considering what mechanism the City could use to accomplish site control, including offering the developers a formal option to lease the property.

The developers are also seeking additional predevelopment funds, which may enhance the state's perception that the project is ready, thus making the Berkeley Way Project more competitive for an award of tax credits. We understand that representatives of BRIDGE will attend the HAC meeting to provide further background on the additional funding request.

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION
5/5/16

To: Housing Advisory Commission

From: Igor Tregub, Vice Chair

Subject: Acton Courtyard Rent Overcharges

Recommendation

The Housing Advisory Commission (HAC) recommends to the Berkeley City Council that an appropriate solution be found to mitigate the impacts of rent overcharges in the Acton Overcharges, such as by requiring the property owner to pay the overcharged fund amount into the Housing Trust Fund. To the extent that the City of Berkeley Health, Housing, and Human Services Department is working on a solution, the HAC expresses support for its efforts.

Background

Acton Courtyards, a 71-unit rental property located at the corner of University and Acton (originally 1392 University, now 1370 University) was developed in partnership with the City of Berkeley via the State's Surplus Land Act. The City acquired the land and gave it to the applicant *free of charge*.

The conditions of approval at the Zoning Adjustments Board were for a 71-unit residential project, with 20 "inclusionary" units that would be offered to families at 50% Area Median Income (AMI) (15 units) and 80% AMI (5 units). The other 51 units would be offered to moderate-income households, *at moderate income rents* affordable at 120% of AMI.

The project was originally built by Patrick Kennedy, and then was sold to Equity Residential, one of the largest residential property owners in the country. The property, along with Equity's entire Berkeley portfolio, is currently for sale.

Perhaps as a result of the due diligence process involved in selling the building, Equity recently announced to the tenants of Acton Courtyard that it did not realize – at the time it purchased the property – that there was a regulatory agreement in place that requires that "the remaining fifty-one (51) units are to remain at rents, which do not exceed 120% of AMI." As a result, Equity has been overcharging the tenants of the building by an average of around $800 per unit, potentially more than $400,000 per year in recent years.

Equity has announced to the tenants of the building that those who qualify as earning less than 120% of AMI will be receiving a refund of the overcharges for the current year. Equity has not announced its intention to return the overcharges for previous

years nor for those households who do not qualify at 120% AMI.

Tenants of the property have been in touch with various City Councilmembers to seek guidance about what will happen going forward. However, the HAC's relationship to this issue is clear: among the remedies available to the City are to seek payment "in an amount sufficient to allow the City to provide rental housing equivalent to that wrongfully denied under [the regulatory agreement], in terms of affordability, size, quality, and other appropriate factors." At the very least, Equity Residential should return the excess profits that it received by charging illegally high rents for the past several years.

According to Equity Residential, the City of Berkeley only started publishing 120% AMI household income and rent figures in 2012. Given how dramatically the housing market has changed in the past three years, this seems as appropriate a threshold as any to gauge how much the overcharges are.

The HAC proposes to advise the City Council to demand that Equity Residential return the entire amount of overcharges for the past three years as part of any regulatory proceedings to bring this property into compliance. The sum of overcharges may exceed $1,000,000. By capping the time period at the previous 3 years, only the years for which Berkeley 120% AMI data were made available can be included, and the burden of calculating the overcharges will be minimal. Any tenant households who qualify as earning 120% AMI should receive a refund, and the overcharges for the remaining tenants should be contributed to the Housing Trust Fund, so that the City can "provide rental housing equivalent to that wrongfully denied" by Equity Residential's illegally high rents.

To the extent that, per conversation with staff, the City of Berkeley Health, Housing, and Human Services Department is working on a solution, the HAC expresses support for its efforts.

Additional References

1. http://www.berkeleydailyplanet.com/issue/2001-06-04/article/5252?headline=University-Avenue-71-unit-housing-project-approved---By-John-Geluardi-Daily-Planet-staff

2. http://www.berkeleyside.com/2015/11/16/equity-residential-to-sell-8-berkeley-apartment-buildings/

3. Minutes of applicable Berkeley City Council action

5/5/2016 HAC
Attachment 3-A Acton Courtyard

Page One

University Avenue 71-unit housing project approved

By John Geluardi Daily Planet staff
Monday June 04, 2001

SHARE

The Zoning Adjustments Board approved a use permit for a proposed development of 71 residential units and 7,200 square feet of commercial space at 1392 University Ave. at Acton Street late last week.

About 30 residents, most opposing the project, crammed into a second floor conference room at 2120 Milvia St. last Thursday to attend a public hearing on the project, according to neighborhood activist Howie Muir.

The City Council gave the land, which was owned by the state, to the developers, for-profit Panoramic Interests and the nonprofit Jubilee Restoration at a May 25, 1999 council meeting in exchange for a minimum of 20 affordable housing units.

The council chose Panoramic Interests and Jubilee Restoration over the nonprofit Affordable Housing Associates despite the fact that Panoramic was proposing a much larger development than what zoning policy allows.

The AHA proposal not only fit within zoning guidelines but was recommended by the Housing Advisory Commission.

The council gave the project to Panoramic and Jubilee by a vote of 6-3 with Vice Mayor Maudelle Shirek and Councilmembers Dona Spring and Linda Maio voting no.

Councilmember Dona Spring said the council chose Panoramic and Jubilee because the president, Patrick Kennedy, has an undue amount of influence over the majority of the councilmembers.

"Patrick Kennedy is an expert at getting councilmembers indebted to him," she said. "He finds their needs and desires and does everything he can to capitalize on them."

Kennedy is the developer of the downtown Gaia Building and will soon start development of a controversial four-story project at 2700 San Pablo Ave.

Muir said after the ZAB members listened to public comment, most of which decried the size of the development, board member David Blake said the ZAB could do little to alter the size of the development because of a resolution the City Council adopted at the same time it awarded the property to Kennedy.

According to that resolution, the project will include 15, 2-bedroom units for tenants who earn 50 percent of the area median, which for a family of three is $30,400 a year. The other five units will be set aside for earning 80 percent of the area income, which for a family of three is $48,640.

"We gave the developers that land and I just hope were getting our money's worth of affordable housing out of the deal," Spring said.

The property was appraised at $1.5 million in 1999.

Spring said she would like to see Kennedy do the right thing and add at least another 15 units of affordable housing to the project.

"If he rents those units out to Section 8 tenants, he'll be getting market, or close to market, rents," She said. "And there are so many Section 8 families in Berkeley who can't use their vouchers because there are so few available units."

Links we like:
www.BerkeleyArtsFestival.com/
www.berkeleycouncilwatch.com/
Richard Brenneman: Eats, Shoots 'n' Leaves
Thomas Lord: BerkeleyNativeSun.com
Jane Stillwater's Web Log

Email to subscribe at berkeleydailyplanet.com.
and get free email updates.

The Pepper Spray Times
Read The April Issue
(and please support Grace Underpressure with a donation :-)
Donate

5/5/2016 HAC
Attachment 3 - B Acton Courtyard

Real estate

Equity Residential to sell 8 Berkeley apartment buildings

November 16, 2015 3:00 pm by Frances Dinkelspiel

Four of the Berkeley properties Equity Residential is selling. Photo: Eastdil Secured

Equity Residential, which owns eight buildings with 452 apartments in Berkeley, as well as the entitlement rights to build the 205-unit Acheson Commons complex on University Avenue, is putting its entire Berkeley portfolio up for sale.

No price is mentioned on the listing documents prepared by Eastdil Secured, Equity's advisor and broker, but the sale should be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. That could mean millions of dollars in transfer taxes for Berkeley's general fund.

"There's an upside and a downside," said Mayor Tom Bates about the sale. "We will get a tremendous property transfer tax from this, probably around $2 million. The property they have on University will probably get developed. That is also good for us. The downside is whoever buys it may be more aggressive with rents… It is going to put tremendous pressure on our rental properties."

San Francisco-based Eastdil Secured is marketing the buildings, many of which are in downtown Berkeley, as the "Berkeley Apartment Collection." The portfolio includes eight buildings with 452 units and an average age of 13 years; 39,891 square feet of retail space; and 289 parking spaces. In one of its emails, the company touts the buildings' proximity to UC Berkeley and BART, its steady supply of student-tenants, and the fact that rents in Berkeley are rapidly increasing.

"Market rents in Berkeley have increased 57% since 2010, and 13% in the last year alone," reads the email sent out by Eastdil Secured. "Consistent demand from a large student population, a well-compensated workforce,

and a shortage of new Class A supply have combined to generate an average vacancy rate of just 3.6% over the past six years."

The 8 buildings that Equity Residential is putting up for sale. Photo: Eastdil Secured

The properties include the Gaia Building at 2117 Allston Way; the Bachenheimer Building at 2119 University; Berkeleyan Apartments at 1910 Oxford St.; Acton Courtyard at 1370 University; The Touriel Building at 2004 University; the ARTech Building at 2002 Addison St.; Renaissance Villas at 1627 University; and Acheson Commons at 2133 University.

Equity, which was started by Chicago businessman Sam Zell, is probably selling its Berkeley portfolio because the apartments don't fit in with the mix of its other properties in the Bay Area, according to Bates. Equity owns more than 5,000 units in the Bay Area, but has recently been planning — and building — luxury apartments in San Francisco. The company may have decided to concentrate on the market for upscale housing rather than student housing, he said.

"When they look at their real estate holdings they don't have student housing," said Bates. "They prefer to have high-rise luxury towers. This doesn't fit with their corporate plans."

John Hyjer, Equity's vice president for investments in Northern California, did not return calls for comment.

Equity Residential acquired most of its Berkeley buildings in April 2007 when it purchased the Berkeley portfolio from Patrick Kennedy's Panoramic Interests for about $146 million, the largest real estate transaction in Berkeley's history. Kennedy said at the time that he was the largest landlord for UC Berkeley students.

Equity Residential is probably the second largest landlord in Berkeley. The largest is the Lakireddy family, which owns more than 1,000 units.

Equity Residential has been a force in Berkeley politics. In 2010, it contributed $25,000 toward the passage of Measure R, which created a blueprint for a more densely developed downtown. It passed with 64% of the vote.

Equity Residential once planned to redevelop a square block of downtown and construct 205 apartments in a development named Acheson Commons. Now the company is seeking to sell the project, along with others. Photo: Tracey Taylor

Questions have been swirling for months about the fate of Acheson Commons, a huge apartment complex along Shattuck and University avenues. Equity Residential won city approval to develop the property in 2013, but construction never began. Equity has been issued building permits for the site and has arranged for the transfer of two old brown-shingled houses off the property, allowing the complex to be constructed without further bureaucratic hurdles.

Considering low-interest rates and high demand for housing, observers were curious why Equity had not started construction. Hyjer told Berkeleyside earlier this year that Equity still planned to proceed. The company was just trying to time construction correctly so the units could open at the end of the summer when students are coming back to school. The company didn't want to have units sit empty for any length of time, he said.

Interest in the properties is already strong among Bay Area developers, according to Bates.

"There are a number of people interested in buying it," he said.

Related:
City's largest ever apartment building gets go-ahead (07.11.13)
Acheson Commons sent back to Berkeley Rent Board (03.07.13)
1,000 new apartments planned for downtown Berkeley (02.07.13)
Ace Hardware will not move to Andronico's old space (09.18.12)

MINUTES

BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING

TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1998

Preliminary Matters

Roll Call: 7:15 p.m.

Present: Councilmembers Armstrong, Breland, Maio, Olds, Shirek, Spring, Woolley, Worthington and Mayor Dean.

Absent: None.

Comments From The City Manager: None

Comments from the Public: Charles Davis, L. A. Wood, Don Duncan, Pastor Earl Bill, Madge Gates, Kelvin Lewis, Kristin Prentice, Charles Lindsay, Anwar Zeidi, Ove Wittstock, Debbie Moore, Larry Johnson, Sean Scott. Elected persons Miriam Topel and Max Anderson.

Consent Calendar

Action: Moved, seconded, carried (Breland/Maio) to adopt the Consent Calendar in one motion except as indicated.

1. **Ordinances for Second Reading**
   a. Amending Ordinance No. 6199-N.S. (BMC Chapter 13.32) to Ban Nudity in Public Places to make violation either an infraction or a misdemeanor and delete the exemption contained in 13.32.020D (Noes: Shirek, Spring, Worthington; Abstain: Maio)

   Action: Removed from the Consent Calendar by Councilmember Worthington. Moved, seconded, carried (Armstrong/Woolley; Noes – Maio, Shirek, Spring, Worthington) to adopt Ordinance No. 6446-N.S. Effective: August 20, 1998.

   b. Adding Chapter 20.66 to Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC)Title 20, Signs, prohibiting advertising of tobacco products in publicly visible locations within 1200 feet of schools and parks. (Absent: Woolley)

   Action: Adopted Ordinance No. 6447-N.S. Effective: January 21, 1999.

b. Planning Commission Report
Recommendation: That Council select Alternative One, the curved box girder structure for the I-80 Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing; and reconsider the relative placement of the bicycle and pedestrian portions of the overcrossing in light of the potential safety hazards presented by faster-moving bicycles on the inside lane.

c. Parks and Recreation Commission Report
Recommendation: That a curved alignment over the freeway be pursued so as to minimize blind spots and maximize scenic views for users; user amenities such as fencing, railing and lighting be pursued that will give the bridge a landmark status and make it as pleasing for the users as the drivers on the freeway; all ramping and pathways in the two parks should be designed to enhance the park settings, and the design should explore solutions that provide on-grade connections which create safe, aesthetic, ease of maintenance conditions; and staff explore various design solutions that address these concerns, and pursue all appropriate permits.

d. Waterfront Commission Report
Recommendation: Adopt Option #1 (the Curved Box Girder Bridge) as the design solution for the proposed bridge crossing over I-80 at the foot of University Avenue, as described in the report from the Planning Commission.

e. Communications:
1. Steven Grover & Associates, 800 Heinz, Studio 11

Action: Held over to July 28, 1998.

56. Surplus State Property at 2002 Acton/1392 University Avenue
From: City Manager
Recommendation: 1) Adopt first reading of an Ordinance authorizing the City Manager to execute, as Optionee, the Option and Purchase and Sales Agreement between the City and State of California for the surplus State property at Acton and University (2002 Acton/1392 University); and 2) adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to issue a Request for Proposals to develop the property, setting criteria and establishing a process to select a developer, and authorizing staff to make the selection.
Action: Moved to Consent Calendar by Mayor Dean. Adopted first reading of Ordinance. Second reading scheduled for July 28, 1998. Adopted Resolution No. 59,655-N.S. with direction to the City Manager to bring back recommendation for developer for Council approval.

57. People's Park Restrooms
From: Parks and Recreation Commission
Recommendation: That Council make the restrooms at People's Park available 24 hours a day until a workable option can be developed.

a. City Manager Report
Recommendation: That Council not approve the recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Commission to open the restrooms in People's Park 24 hours a day.
Action: Held over to July 28, 1998

RESOLUTION NO. 61,215-N.S.

AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF THE ZONING ADJUSTMENTS BOARD TO APPROVE USE PERMIT #00-10000103 TO CONSTRUCT A FIVE-STORY MIXED-USE BUILDING WITH 71 APARTMENT UNITS (20 AFFORDABLE), 7,250 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREAS AND 62 PARKING SPACES

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2001, the Zoning Adjustments Board considered the application for a mixed-use building at 1392 University Avenue and, after receiving public testimony, closed the public hearing and approved Use Permit #00-10000103 to construct said building, and adopted the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, on July 5, 2001, Bonnie Dehler, Carol Sullivan, and members of the Berkeley Way, Acton Street, Chestnut Street, and Hearst Neighborhood Group appealed the decision of the Zoning Adjustments Board; and

WHEREAS, on July 24, 2001, the City Council considered the appeal of the Zoning Adjustments Board approval of Use Permit #00-10000103; and

WHEREAS, on July 24, 2001, the City Council, considered the public record and the reports and analyses presented and prepared by Staff, and voted to affirm the Zoning Adjustments Board decision to approve the use permit and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Berkeley rejects the appeal of the approval of Use Permit #00-10000103 and affirms the Zoning Adjustment Board's adoption of the MND and approval of the Use Permit pursuant to the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval and Mitigations adopted by the Zoning Adjustments Board on May 31, 2001.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on July 24, 2001 by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Armstrong, Breland, Hawley, Olds, and Mayor Dean

Noes: Councilmembers Maio, Spring and Worthington.

Abstain: Councilmember Shirek.

Absent: None.

Shirley Dean, Mayor

Attest: _____
Sherry M. Kelly, City Clerk

MINUTES

BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2002

Preliminary Matters

Roll Call: 7:11 p.m.

Present: Councilmembers Armstrong, Breland, Hawley, Maio, Olds, Shirek, Spring, Worthington and Mayor Dean.

Absent: None.

Ceremonial Matters:

a. Proclamation Honoring Student Commissioners Day

b. Proclamation honoring Marcus Ashley congratulating him on his UC Berkeley scholarship and his involvement in youth programs.

Actions: Presented proclamations.

Comments from the City Manager:

1. The Bay Trail West Frontage Road to the Ashby Interchange will be closed from May 15 through May 29 between the hours of 9 am and 3pm.

2. "Bike to Work Day" is on May 16. The City is sponsoring a breakfast from 7:00 to 10:00 a.m. in front of the Public Safety Building. The Health and Human Services Department will display bicycle safety equipment including helmets.

3. There will be an I-80 Pedestrian Bridge Workshop on May 18 from 10 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. to discuss ideas for Bridge enhancement.

Comments from the Public: Graham Brownstein, Cynthia Wooten, Rebecca Davis, Clare Weaver, Jill Posener, Hoang Phan, Frank Moore, Ethan Kaplan, Jen Neiber, Alexis Maten, and David Raymond.

Comments from Youth: Micki Weinberg.

49. **Issuance of Special Tax Bonds**
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the issuance of 2002 Community Facilities District No. 1 Fire Protection Equipment Project Bonds in an amount not to exceed $9,750,000; approving a form of indenture, a form of official notice of sale of bonds and notice of intention to sell bonds; authorizing the official statement relating thereto; and authorizing the execution of necessary documents.
Contact: Fran David, Finance, 981-7300, Reginald Garcia, Fire, 981-3473
Action: Moved to Consent Calendar by Councilmember Armstrong. Adopted Resolution No. 61,559–N.S.

50. **Fee Waiver And Deferral Request For Acton Courtyard Apartments, 2002 Acton/1392 University Avenue**
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution waiving $78,000 in building permit related fees and defer remaining fees for which waiver was requested (except sewer connection fees) until one year after completion of construction. Applicant shall pay sewer connection fees when building permits are issued.
Contact: Carol Barrett, Planning and Development, 705-8102
Action: Moved, seconded, carried (Breland/Olds; Noes – Maio, Spring, Shirek and Worthington) to adopt Resolution No. 61,560–N.S.

51. **Inclusion of Accessible Pedestrian Signals in Countdown Signal Installations**
From: Commission on Disability
Recommendation: Instruct staff to delay the installation of countdown signals at designated intersections until accessible pedestrian signals (APS) are also installed on each of the signals currently receiving the countdown technology and/or until an audio component is also installed with the countdown signals.
Contact: Paul Church, Secretary, 981-6342
a. City Manager Report
Recommendation: Continue with the installation of the countdown signals at the designated test intersections scheduled to receive them. As a general rule, when substantial alterations are made to existing signals, or when new signals are being installed, accessible pedestrian signals should also be installed.
Contact: Peter Hillier, Transportation, 981-7000
Action: Moved to the Consent Calendar by Councilmember Hawley to approve the City Manager's recommendation as amended by Councilmember Spring to make the lights accessible as soon as possible and when funding is available and referring to the Commission on Disability developing a priority list.

RESOLUTION NO. 61,560–N.S.

WAIVING $78,000 IN BUILDING PERMIT-RELATED FEES AND DEFERRING CERTAIN FEES FOR ACTON COURTYARD APARTMENTS, 2002 ACTON/1392 UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, on May 25, 1999 the City Council approved Resolution No. 60,047-N.S. selecting Panoramic Interests/Jubilee Restoration to develop affordable housing on the State surplus property at 2002 Acton Street pursuant to the City's Option and Purchase and Sales Agreement with the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) approved Use Permits for a 71 unit residential project (15 units affordable to households at of below 50% of Area Median Income (AMI), five units affordable to households at or below 80% of AMI, and the remaining market-rate units affordable to households at or below 120% AMI) on May 31, 2001; and

WHEREAS, the City Council affirmed the ZAB approval on June 24, 2001; and

WHEREAS, Acton Courtyard Apartments, LLC (a limited liability company formed by Panoramic Interests, Jubilee Restoration, and equity investors) requested waiver and deferral of building and zoning permit application fees for an affordable housing project proposed at 1392 University Avenue (the new address for 2002 Acton Street); and

WHEREAS, Chapter 19.62 of the Berkeley Municipal Code grants the City Manager the authority to waive or defer payment of any permit fees, except for new sewer connection fees, for any housing project in which at least 25% of the units are low and/or moderate income, and the project exceeds this minimum requirement; and

WHEREAS, while the City's Request for Proposal (RFP) for the project indicated that the price for the land to be paid by the developer would be a minimum of $40,000 to reimburse the State for its costs of administration, the State subsequently required the developer to pay an additional $78,000 for the proportion of the land to be used for the ground floor commercial component; and

WHEREAS, the City encourages mixed-use projects on commercial corridors such as University Avenue.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that $78,000 in building permit-related fees be waived for 1392 University/2002 Acton, and that the remaining fees for which waiver was requested (except sewer connection fees) be deferred until one year after completion of construction.

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED THAT, pursuant to Council Resolution No. 60601-N.S., fees cannot be waived unless an alternative source of funding is identified.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED THAT Budget Code No. 010-9701-000 (savings from the FY 2002 Public Liability Fund) is identified as an alternative source of funding for the fee waiver.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on May 14, 2002 by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Armstrong, Breland, Hawley, Olds, and Mayor Dean.

Noes: Councilmembers Maio, Shirek, Spring and Worthington.

Absent: None.

Shirley Dean
Shirley Dean, Mayor

Attest: Sherry
Sherry M. Kelly, City Clerk

To: Housing Advisory Commission

From: Commissioner Soto-Vigil

Date: Cinco de Mayo, 2016

Subject: Re-implement and Fund the City of Berkeley Housing Retention Program

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Housing Advisory Commission recommend that Berkeley City Council re-implement and substantially fund the City of Berkeley Housing Retention Program

BACKGROUND:

The City of Berkeley's Housing Retention Program provides grant assistance to help pay back rent to prevent Berkeley residents from being evicted. Grants were available to households that met a specified eligibility criteria. Submitting an application did not guarantee financial assistance. For more details see the attachment.

April 20, 2016

TO: Housing Advisory Commissioners

FROM: Moderate-Income Housing Subcommittee

RE: Draft Action Plan

Background

The purpose of the Moderate-Income Housing Subcommittee is to develop several policy recommendations to present to the HAC for discussion. Some or all of these recommendations would then be presented to the City Council. The subcommittee met on April 19, 2016 and agreed to explore several policies directed at expanding housing opportunities for moderate-income households. Some or all of these policies may prove to be worthy of additional consideration. We have listed the policies below. Our next step will be to consider the benefits, costs, and suitability to Berkeley of each policy.

As part of this work, we will also study what income limits to consider for these potential policies. We will consider the moderate-/workforce-incomes defined by HCD and HUD, census data, as well typical wages paid in public sector employment, such as teaching. Households in this income group "fall between the cracks," since they are over-income for most state and federal subsidy programs, while at the same time their incomes are insufficient to purchase housing in the Berkeley housing market. It will be important to define what this income range is.

Also, during our initial meeting, several other issues came up that are not just policy concerns for moderate-income households, but for development more generally. One example are the fees charged as well as other planning barriers.[1] Another policy concern is how to help seniors "age in place." These could be issues to consider in the future.

Proposed Policies to Examine

Ownership Options

- Work with Berkeley Unified School District to determine if there is surplus land on which to build housing for teachers.

[1] . In fact, an examination of these fees has been proposed by Mayor Bates as part of his Housing Emergency proposals and also supported by the compromise proposal put forth by Councilmembers, Worthington and Capitelli.

- Examine and evaluate condominium conversion policies in multiple situations, including units built with an underlying condominium map, but operated as rentals; duplex and small multiples operated as rentals but which could be converted to condominiums, TIC properties and potentially additional situations. Whenever possible, the subcommittee will try to quantify the approximate numbers of units that could lend themselves to conversion.

- Potential ownership duplex on what is currently a single family site. This is different than ADU policy more generally in that ownership would be subdivided between the larger unit and the smaller unit.

- Alternative models to develop new housing, including land trusts and co-ops.

Rental Options

- Examine ways to encourage owners of vacant rental units to make these units available.

- Examine ways to encourage more ADU rental housing.

- Examine ways to encourage homeowners to rent out excess space in single family homes.

Next Steps

If a majority of the HAC members are not supportive of a particular policy, we should decide this at the onset, so that the subcommittee members spend their time efficiently in the next several months. Following each of our subcommittee meetings, we will provide updates to the HAC as a whole. Finally it is our intention to have a draft Action Plan completed by September 2 016 for discussion at the October 2016 HAC meeting.

DATE: April 18, 2016

TO: Susan

FROM: Marian

RE: **Framework for Housing Proposals**

I want to provide some framework for the housing proposals that have been made. I reviewed two documents - the Annotated Agenda (April 5, 2016) provided to the HAC for its April 7th meeting and the Worthington/Capitelli Compromise Proposal distributed at the City Council Meeting on April 5, 2016.

I have separated the lists of proposals into three categories: Those that do not require an Action Plan to get started, zoning changes which can be included in an Action Plan, but also require more public discussion, and those policies that should be included in a longer term planning process, guided by a Housing Action Plan. In a few places I have added my comments. Finally, at the end of this memo I have provided my suggestion of how the Nexus Study could be used to establish the percentages of inclusionary units by income groups that could be required of developers. (This approach is used by other cities.)

Also, I believe you mentioned that the City has already approved your suggestion of analyzing city owned properties for potential for housing development, so I did not include this policy below. Finally, there is no reason to make specific references to the National Housing Trust Fund (item XVIII on the Worthington/Capitelli Proposal). The new National Housing Trust Fund is one source of additional funds that the City will be able to access - I believe through the State – and not a specific policy for the City to act on.

Let me know if you want more follow-up on any of these suggestions. We already discussed several issues of these at our lunch on Wednesday (April 13, 2016).

1. <u>Policies that do not need to wait for the completion of a Housing Action Plan</u>. These include the following:

    - Periodic review of Mitigation Fee
    - Examination of development fees on new construction
    - Support for Alameda County Housing Bond
    - Provide predevelopment funding for Bridge/BFHP Proposal. (Note: I mention predevelopment funding only. This project will require a significant amount of

subsidy, and whether the City should direct the major share of its HTF funds for this project needs to be considered in the Housing Action Plan.)

- Short Term Rental policy
- Funding options to augment the HTF that are already under consideration, such as the Business License Tax and the Transfer Tax.
- Evaluation of new ADU policies
- Large Landlord Business Tax increase and other potential Ballot Issues
- Prevailing wage requirement on properties receiving HTF funds (These wage levels are generally required by other funding agencies as well.)
- Examination of issues related to condominium conversions and condominium ownership

2. Zoning Changes that warrant additional consideration, either as part of the Housing Action Plan or as individual agenda items:

- Revised height limits on residential buildings in PDA's.
- Reaffirmation of Green Affordable Housing Package
- Several zoning recommendations on page 12 of the April 5, 2012 Annotated Agenda.

These include By-Right approval of Downtown Projects defined in Item 7
General Plan Amendment defined in Item 8
Establishment of buffer zones around PDAs defined in Item 9
Zoning changes in areas defined in Item 10
Revising height limits presented in Item 11

3. Policies to Consider in a Housing Action Plan

- Tax and Fee Waivers for Section 8
- City Density Bonus (Personally, I think that this should be dropped from further consideration. The State Density Bonus already allows up to an increase of 35%, and we have already up-zoned areas in Berkeley.)
- Identification of additional ways to increase the HTF
- Consideration of funding allocations for predevelopment planning work
- Increase in Tenant Relocation Fees, Ellis Act Evictions
- Workforce Housing Affordability Plan
- Use of Eminent Domain on Vacant and Blighted Properties
- "Tiny" House Program

4. Housing Mitigation Fee – this was passed on April 5, 2016 – all that remains is deciding how the 20% inclusionary requirement (in-lieu of paying impact fees on rental housing) will be allocated. I do not recommend going beyond the top limit of moderate-income (120% AMI). One approach to consider would be based on the percentages of units defined in the March 2015 Draft BAE Nexus Study. (I looked to see if there was a final report, but I only see a draft study.) Using the nexus results may result in a less political process.

   The percentage allocation would be as follows:

	Income Groups				
	Very Low	Low	Median	Moderate	Total
No. of HHs	11.48	5.88	8.18	4.68	30.22
Percentage	38%	19%	27%	15%	100%
Rounded %	40%	20%	25%	15%	100%

Source: Based on findings reported on Table 9, page 16, Draft BAE Nexus Study

(Note: I combined the extremely low-income with the low-income, since I really do not believe that it is realistic to target units to renters at 30% AMI and below in market rate projects. This is primarily because households at this level need additional services that are not available in market rate developments.)

Housing Advisory Commission – Subcommittee Membership 4/28/2016

Name	Short Term Rentals	CDBG	HTF	Moderate Income Housing (80-160%)	New Strategies (<80% AMI)
Jill Martinucci	**X**	**Chair**		**Vice Chair**	
Tor Berg		**X**			**X**
Igor Tregub	**Chair**	**X**			**X**
Brendan Darrow	**X**		**X**		
Heidi Abramson			**X**	**X**	
Marian Wolfe				**Chair**	
Alejandro Soto-Vigil			**Chair**		
Diego Aguilar-Canabal			**X**		**X**
Kathleen Crandall	**X**	**X**		**X**	

Notes:

Short term rental is inactive and will sunset one month after the item goes to Council.

1

ALAMEDA COUNTY
hcd
Housing & Community Development

ALAMEDA COUNTY
Community Development Agency

OVERVIEW DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR ALAMEDA COUNTY HOUSING BOND

Housing Bond Work Session 4-25-16

Presentation Outline

2

- Process and Stakeholder Input Update
- Criteria for Bond Programs
- Overview of Draft Bond Program Framework
  - Homeowner Programs
    - Down Payment Assistance
    - Accessibility
    - Housing Preservation Fund
  - Rental Housing Programs
    - Rental Housing Development Program
    - Innovation & Opportunity Fund
- Next Steps

Process Overview & Schedule

- **March 2 – April 8, 2016 – Stakeholder Process**

County-facilitated stakeholder process to discuss county housing needs, receive input and feedback on desired programs, and engage other interested parties.

- **April 10 – May 22 – Draft Bond Program**

Policy and programmatic proposals discussed with stakeholders, city housing staff and officials, County housing staff, and Supervisors to develop a proposed program for use of housing bond funds.

- **May 2 – May 22 – Supervisorial District Town Hall Meetings**

District town hall meetings to be held in each Supervisorial district to inform and educate constituents about the housing bond, and to garner feedback.

Goal: to present the final housing bond measure language and authorizing resolution to be voted on by the full Board of Supervisors on June 14, 2016.

Stakeholder Input Process

- **Board of Supervisors Committee Work Sessions:**

  Next: **May 16, 9:30 am, 1221 Oak St., 5th Floor**

  Board Chambers

Stakeholder Meetings:

- May – **Town hall meetings in Supervisorial Districts**

- **On-line Survey: www.tinyurl.com/alcohousingbond**
- **Email: alcohousingbond@acgov.org**
- **Website: http://www.acgov.org/board/housingbond.htm**

Stakeholder Input Update

5

- **Overall, new input consistent with previous**
  - 120 Survey Respondents
  - March 17 and April 13 Stakeholder meetings
  - Emails and other

Stakeholder Input Highlights

Priority Populations

- House the most vulnerable (prioritize)
- Homeless people:
  - with disabilities, including mental illness
  - Chronically homeless people with substance abuse issues
  - Homeless families with children
  - Homeless youth/foster care youth
- People with Disabilities
  - Physical, mental, developmental
- Low-income seniors
- Extremely Low Income people
- Very Low Income people

Stakeholder Input Highlights

Priority Populations, continued

7

- Elderly homeowners and tenant families at risk of displacement
- Veterans
- Moderate-income renters
- Renters who don't qualify for Section 8
- Tenants
- Teachers and First Responders
- Working poor
- Work force housing
- First-time homebuyers

Stakeholder Input Highlights
Affordability/Income Levels

- **Deeply affordable housing for lowest income levels**
  - SSI income level (15% of AMI)
  - 20% of rental funds for 20% of AMI
  - Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)
  - Very Low Income (50% of AMI)
  - Under 60% AMI
  - Under 80% AMI
- **Middle income (80-120% of AMI)**
  - Population mix in rental
  - Homeownership
- **Maintain long-term/permanent affordability**

hcd

Community Development Agency

CRITERIA FOR BOND PROGRAMS

Housing Bond Work Session 4-25-16

Criteria for Bond Program

- Eligible uses of G.O. Bond proceeds
- Addresses critical housing needs
- Simple to explain
- Simple to administer
- Assures all parts of the County benefit
- Allocates funds over time
- Builds on successful program models within Alameda County and elsewhere
- Leverage other funds where possible
- Allows for innovation and creativity

Basic Assumptions

- Issue bonds in 3 issuances, approximately 2 years apart, e.g.:
  - $200 Million 2017
  - $200 Million 2019
  - $100 Million 2021

- Each Program Component starts at 1st issuance and continues through 2nd and 3rd

ALAMEDA COUNTY
hcd
Housing & Community Development

ALAMEDA COUNTY
Community Development Agency

DRAFT
HOME OWNER
PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Housing Bond Work Session 4-25-16

Homeowner Programs

13

- **Three Program Areas:**
  - Down Payment Assistance Program
  - Senior/Disabled Home Accessibility Program
  - Home Preservation Fund

- **Common Components:**
  - Countywide Allocations
  - Revolving Loan Funds

Homeowner Programs

Down Payment Assistance Loan Program

14

- **Estimated Allocation Level: $50 Million**
- **Goal: Assist middle income working families to purchase homes and stay in Alameda County**

- **Program Parameters:**
  - Income limit: 80-120% of Area Median
    - e.g. Teachers, Electricians, Plumbers, Firefighters, Truck Drivers
- Design features to encourage program to benefit current Alameda County residents, for example:
  - Workforce Proximity Homeownership
  - Assist current residents to buy homes and stay in County
  - Teachers/First Responders

- **Estimated Households Assisted: 600-1000**

Homeowner Programs

Accessibility Loan Program

15

- **Estimated Allocation Level: $10 Million**
- **Goal: Assist Seniors and People with Disabilities to remain in their homes**
- **Program Parameters:**
  - Income limit: 80% of Area Median
  - Accessibility improvements up to $15,000
- **Estimated Households Assisted: 500 – 1,000**

Homeowner Programs

Home Preservation Fund

16

- **Estimated Allocation Level: $15 Million**
- **Goal: Assist Low Income homeowners to retain their housing and stay in their homes**

- **Program Parameters:**
  - Income limit: 50% or 80% of Area Median
  - Possible Program Areas:
    - Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation
    - One-time back taxes and/or overdue mortgage payments

- **Estimated Households Assisted: 300-1,000**

ALAMEDA COUNTY
hcd
Housing & Community Development

ALAMEDA COUNTY
Community Development Agency

DRAFT RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Housing Bond Work Session 4-25-16

Rental Housing Programs

18

- **Two Program Areas:**
  - Rental Housing Development
  - Innovation & Opportunity Fund

Rental Housing Development Program

- **Estimated Funding Allocation: $400 Million**
- **Goal: Create and preserve affordable rental housing for vulnerable populations, including workforce housing**

- **Program Parameters:**
  - **Income levels:**
    - Most = 30-60% of Area Median Income
    - Match with operating subsidies to target at least 20% of funds to 20% AMI or below
    - Possibly permit portion of funds for up to 80% AMI in mixed income developments
  - **Leverage** tax credits, other state, federal and local funds
  - **Require City financial contribution**
  - **Long-term affordability**

Rental Housing Development Program

- **Use of funds:**
  - Development gap financing:
    - Predevelopment and Development financing
    - New Construction, Acquisition, Rehabilitation
  - **Target populations:**
    - Homeless (chronic, families)
    - Seniors
    - Veterans
    - Workforce housing (including working poor)
    - People with disabilities (physical, developmental, mentally ill)

Estimated Households Assisted: 2,000 – 3,000

Rental Housing Development Program Geographic Allocation

21

- **Based on:**
  - Simple to explain
  - Related to need
  - Assure that funds are available for projects throughout County

- **Geographic Allocation Model:**
  - Half of funds to a base allocation for use in each city*
  - Half of funds to regional pools to be drawn on by projects in any city in region

*including allocation to unincorporated county

Rental Housing Development Program
Geographic Allocation Model

Half of Funds to Base City Allocations		
City Base Allocations By:	Total Population	
Alameda city	4.9%	$9,746,699
Albany city	1.2%	$2,445,077
Berkeley city	7.4%	$14,855,841
Dublin city	3.1%	$6,206,424
Emeryville city	0.7%	$1,329,557
Fremont city	14.2%	$28,421,727
Hayward city	9.6%	$19,171,235
Livermore city	5.4%	$10,739,893
Newark city	2.8%	$5,619,809
Oakland city	25.9%	$51,719,462
Piedmont city	0.7%	$1,413,713
Pleasanton city	4.7%	$9,312,893
San Leandro city	5.6%	$11,208,352
Unincorporated - Mid County	9.3%	$18,600,773
Union City city	4.6%	$9,208,545
Alameda County Total	100.0%	$200,000,000

Half of Funds to Regional Pools		
Regional Pools Allocations by:	% of Total	Need - Blend of Poverty and RHNA LI&VLI
North County	44.7%	$89,325,065
Mid County	24.9%	$49,803,134
East County	13.7%	$27,332,372
South County	16.8%	$33,539,429
Alameda County Total	100.0%	$200,000,000

Rental Housing Program

Innovation & Opportunity Fund

23

- **Estimated Funding Allocation: $25 Million**
- **Goal: Respond quickly to capture market opportunities, preserve and expand affordable housing, tenant anti-displacement**
- **Program Possibilities - Examples:**
  - Rapid response high-opportunity pre-development and site acquisition loans
    - Purchase problem motels and convert to affordable housing
  - Bond-qualified rental anti-displacement opportunities
    - Acquire apartment buildings on market to renovate and make/retain affordability
- **Countywide Allocation**

ALAMEDA COUNTY
hcd
Housing & Community Development

ALAMEDA COUNTY
Community Development Agency

NEXT STEPS

Next Steps

- Bond Counsel review
- Continue stakeholder input
- Further develop and refine program options
- Refine bond cost projections
- Draft measure language
- Prepare materials for Board consideration to place measure on November 2016 ballot

DISCUSSION

Alameda County Income Limits

Persons in Household	Extremely Low		Very Low		Low	Median	Moderate
	20%	30%	50%	60%	80%	100%	120%
1	$13,660	$20,500	$34,150	$40,980	$52,650	$68,300	$81,960
2	$15,600	$23,400	$39,000	$46,800	$60,150	$78,000	$93,600
3	$17,560	$26,350	$43,900	$52,680	$67,650	$87,800	$105,360
4	$19,500	$29,250	$48,750	$58,500	$75,150	$97,500	$117,000

Effective March 2016
Adjusted annually
Based on HUD Extremely (30%), Very Low (50%) and Low (80%) Income limits
Alameda County Housing and Community Development, April 2016