HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION
AGENDA

Regular Meeting
Thursday, November 7, 2019
7:00 pm

South Berkeley Senior Center
2939 Ellis Street
Secretary Mike Uberti
HAC@cityofberkeley.info

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.

1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Approval
3. Public Comment
4. Approval of the September 5, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes – All (Attachment 1)
5. Approval of the October 3, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes – All (Attachment 2)
6. Public Hearing on Community Needs – Rhianna Babka, HHCS (Attachment 3)
7. Public Hearing on the Regional Analysis of Impediments – Rhianna Babka, HHCS (Attachment 4)
8. Discussion and Possible Action to Appoint Subcommittees – All/Staff	a. Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
9. Receive Presentation and Update on Measure T1 Bond Program Phase 1 and Information on Phase 2 Public Process – Sean O’Shea, Public Works (Attachment 5)
10. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt the 2020 Meeting Calendar – All (Attachment 6)
11. Discussion and Possible Action to Establish Process Guidelines for Officer Elections – All (Attachment 7)
12. Discussion and Possible Action to Make Recommendations to Section Five of the City Council’s Draft Affordable Housing Framework – All (Attachment 8)
13. Update and Possible Action to Adopt the Social Housing Subcommittee Recommendation to Hold a Special Meeting – Commissioner Lord (Attachment 9)
14. **Update and Possible Action from the Joint Subcommittee for the Implementation of State Housing Law** – Commissioner Lord

15. **Discussion and Possible Action on Climate Emergency Recommendations for Housing** – Commissioner Lord (Attachment 10)

16. **Update on Council Items (Future Dates Subject to Change)** – All/Staff
   a. Smoke Free Housing Ordinance Amendments (10/29)
   b. Predevelopment Funding Recommendations for 2001 Ashby, 2527 San Pablo, and 2321 10th Street (10/29)
   c. Transfer Tax Refund for 1638 Stuart Street (12/3)

17. **Announcements/Information Items**

18. **Future Items**

19. **Adjourn**

**Attachments**
1. Draft September 5, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes
2. Draft October 3, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes
3. Rhianna Babka, HHCS, Public Hearing on the Regional Analysis of Impediments
4. Rhianna Babka, HHCS, Public Hearing on Community Needs
5. Sean O’Shea, Public Works, Measure T1 Infrastructure Bond Program
6. Mike Uberti, HHCS, Draft 2020 Housing Advisory Commission Meeting Calendar
7. Mike Uberti, HHCS, Officer Elections Information
8. Wolfe, Housing Framework Section Five Outline
9. Lord, Social Housing and Tenants Opportunity to Purchase
10. Lord, Climate Emergency and Housing

**Correspondence**
11. Letter to Council from the Homeless Services Panel of Experts regarding “Housing for a Diverse, Equitable and Creative Berkeley: A Framework for Affordable Housing”
12. Phyllis Orrick, Measure O Housing Template Comments

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 981-6418 (V) or 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the Health, Housing & Community Services Department located at 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor during regular business hours. Agenda packets and minutes are posted online at: https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Housing_Advisory_Commission/

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 commission. 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 for further information.
1. Roll Call
   Present: Mary Kay Lacey (substitute for Xavier Johnson), Thomas Lord, Mari Mendonca, Maryann Sargent (arrived at 7:45 pm), Alex Sharenko, Leah Simon-Weisberg, Marian Wolfe and Amir Wright.
   Absent: Xavier Johnson (excused) and Darrell Owens (excused).
   Commissioners in attendance: 8 of 8
   Staff Present: Amy Davidson and Mike Uberti
   Members of the public in attendance: 16
   Public Speakers: 18

2. Agenda Approval
   Action: M/S/C (Lord/Wright) to approve the agenda.

3. Public Comment
   There was one speaker during public comment.

4. Approval of the June 6, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes
   Action: M/S/C (Sharenko/Wright) to approve the minutes.

5. Discussion and Possible Action to Elect a Temporary Vice Chair for the September 5, 2019 Meeting
   Action: M/S/C (Wright/Lord) to elect Commissioner Wright as Temporary Vice Chair for September 5 meeting.
   Vote: Ayes: Lacey, Lord, Mendonca, Sharenko, Simon-Weisberg, Wolfe and Wright. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Johnson (excused), Owens (excused) and Sargent (unexcused).
6. Discussion and Possible Action on Draft PY18 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)

7.Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Resources for Community Development 2001 Ashby Avenue Predevelopment Loan

Public Speakers: 1

Commissioner Wolfe recused herself from this item as she is on the board of Resources for Community Development, an organization that makes funding requests to the City of Berkeley for development projects.

Action: M/S/C (Simon-Weisberg/Sharenko) recommend Resources for Community Development’s (RCD) predevelopment loan request for an additional $1.2 million for its proposed development at 2001 Ashby Avenue. The HAC also recommends the City require RCD evaluate ways to reduce or eliminate the project’s proposed parking spaces and/or parking footprint, if possible, in consideration of the needs of the residents, community services space, and climate change mitigation.


8. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Northern California Land Trust 2321-2323 10th Street Predevelopment Loan Application

Public Speakers: 1

Commissioner Wolfe recused herself from this item as she is on the board of Resources for Community Development, an organization that makes funding requests to the City of Berkeley for development projects.

Action: M/S/C (Simon-Weisberg/Mendonca) to recommend the Housing Trust Fund subcommittee’s recommendation to approve Northern California Land Trust’s (NCLT) predevelopment loan request for $50,000 for its proposed acquisition and renovation of 2321-2323 10th Street subject to NCLT meeting the conditions of its 2017 Development Loan Agreement and completion of the following items prior to disbursement of funds:

a. NCLT must provide an updated plan for assessing the feasibility of converting 1340-48 Blake and 2425 California to cooperatives; and
b. NCLT must work with its Board to update the organizational documents to include the tripartite structure.

9. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Transfer Tax Refund for 1638 Stuart Street
   Public Speakers: 1

   Action: M/S/C (Lord/Simon-Weisberg) recommend that City Council authorize the City Manager to grant an estimated $10,260 to Bay Area Community Land Trust (BACLT) in the form of a transfer tax refund, in support of the renovation of 1638 Stuart Street and BACLT’s operation of the property as affordable housing.


10. Discussion and Possible Action to Appoint and Extend Subcommittees
    Public Speakers: 6

    Action: M/S/C (Wright /Sargent) to extend the meeting 30 minutes to 9:30 pm.


    Action: M/S/C (Lord/Sharenko) to extend the Social Housing subcommittee through March 31, 2020 and appoint Commissioners Johnson, Lord, Mendonca and Simon-Weisberg.


11. Discussion and Possible Action to Make Recommendations to the City Council’s Draft Affordable Housing Framework
    Public Speakers: 8

    Action: M/S/C (Simon-Weisberg/Sargent) to extend the meeting 15 minutes to 9:45 pm.


    Action: M/S/F (Sargent/Simon-Weisberg) to endorse the Draft Affordable Housing Framework as presented.


12. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt Recommendations to Improve and Enforce the Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Ordinance

13. Update on Council Items
14. Announcements/Information Items

15. Future Items

16. Adjourn
   Action: M/S/C (Sharenko/Wright) to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 pm.

Approved on October 3, 2019

_______________________, Mike Uberti, Secretary
1. Roll Call  
Present: Tor Berg (substitute for Darrell Owens), Xavier Johnson, Thomas Lord, Mari Mendonca, Maryann Sargent, Alex Sharenko, Leah Simon-Weisberg, Marian Wolfe and Amir Wright.  
Absent: Darrell Owens (excused).  
Commissioners in attendance: 9 of 9  
Staff Present: Amanda Montez, Mike Uberti and Jenny Wyant.  
Members of the public in attendance: 19  
Public Speakers: 13

2. Agenda Approval  
Action: M/S/C (Wright/Lord) to approve the agenda.  

3. Public Comment  
There were three speakers during public comment.

4. Discussion on Commission Recommendations to the City Council

5. Approval of the July 11, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes

6. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt Recommendations to Improve and Enforce the Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Ordinance  
Action: M/S/C (Sharenko/Lord) to recommend that City Council:  
1. Make a short term referral directing the City Manager to correct current City Policies for enforcing BMC 12.70.035 so that these policies do not contradict the ordinance. Additionally, modify BMC 12.70.035 to require that second and third complaints must refer to a violation or violations that occur after the 12.70.035(C) notice has been made.  
2. Modify BMC 12.70.035 so that the requirement that signs be posted is enforced as part of the Residential Safety ordinance. Failure to post signage may result in fines, accordingly.
3. Modify BMC 12.70.035 so that repeated failure to provide new tenants with the City’s brochure shall be guilty of an infraction. It shall also be an infraction for landlords to tell new tenants, in contradiction to the law, that tobacco smoking by some tenants is permitted.

4. Provide analysis of the financial impacts of the recommended modifications to the BMC.


Action: M/S/F (Sharenko/Lord) to recommend that City Council:
1. Make a short term referral directing the City Manager to correct current City Policies for Modify BMC 12.70.035 so that the City will receive non-anonymous but confidential complaints and record these for one year. Upon the first such complaint in a 6 month period, the City shall send appropriate notice as in section 12.70.035(C) to all units in the building, informing tenants about the prohibition and penalties. (Confidentially shall be preserved for the personal safety of the filer of such a complaint.) For purposes of (non-confidential) second and third complaints, notice on the basis of a confidential complaint is treated as 12.70.035(C) notice.

2. Modify BMC Modify BMC 12.70.035 so that the requirement that signs be posted is enforced. Establish a City policy that City inspection officers and other enforcement officers who enter a multi-unit residence and observe clear evidence of tobacco smoking may and in some cases should report that fact to the City’s Code Enforcement Officer who shall treat that the same way as a non-anonymous tenant complaint. (Thus, it may serve as the first, second, or third complaint for enforcement purposes.)


7. Discussion and Possible Action to Appoint Subcommittees
   a. 1654 5th Street RFP

Action: M/S/C (Johnson/Wright) to create a 1654th Street RFP Subcommittee to advise the Housing Advisory Commission on the Request for Proposals for the City-owned property at 1654 5th Street and appoint Commissioners Johnson, Lord, Mendonca, Simon-Weisberg through December 31, 2019.


8. Discussion and Possible Action to Make Recommendations to the City Council’s Draft Affordable Housing Framework

Public Speakers: 10

Action: M/S/C (Simon-Weisberg/Shareko) to extend the meeting 30 minutes to 9:30pm.

Action: M/S/C (Shareno/Simon-Weisberg) to extend the meeting 15 minutes to 9:45pm.

Action: M/S/C (Simon-Weisberg/Johnson) to recommend to City Council to adopt the Affordable Housing Framework, with the understanding that the Housing Advisory Commission intends to provide additional feedback on Section V of the report.

9. Update on Council Items

10. Announcements/Information Items

11. Future Items

12. Adjourn
Action: M/S/C (Johnson/Simon-Weisberg) to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 pm.

Approved on November 7, 2019
__________________________, Mike Uberti, Secretary
Hello Community Partners,

This email is to inform you of **two upcoming public hearings**. Both public hearings will take place on November 7th, 2019 during the Housing Advisory Commission meeting. Additional details on the public hearings can be found below and in the attached flyers. Please distribute this email to your network and/or post the flyers at your various locations.

**PUBLIC HEARING #1**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON COMMUNITY NEEDS**

Housing Advisory Commission  
Thursday, November 7, 2019 - 7:00 p.m.  
South Berkeley Senior Center - 2939 Ellis Street (at Ashby)

The purpose of this public hearing is to hear from **Berkeley residents** what services and housing are needed for low-income people in their communities.

City staff will also present information on accomplishments of projects supported with Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant, and HOME Investment Partnerships funding in Fiscal Year 2019. If you have written comments, please mail or deliver them directly to Rhianna Babka, Housing & Community Services Department, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704.

Please contact Rhianna Babka at 510.981.5410 or rbabka@cityofberkeley.info to obtain additional information. Or call the City of Berkeley Health, Housing & Community Services Department at 981-5400. FAX: (510) 981-5450. TDD: (510) 981-6903.

**Accommodations Provided Upon Request.** To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the public hearing, 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. Providing at least three working days’ notice will help to ensure availability at the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING #2**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS**

Housing Advisory Commission  
Thursday, November 7, 2019 - 7:00 p.m.  
South Berkeley Senior Center - 2939 Ellis Street (at Ashby)

The purpose of this public hearing is to receive comments on the draft Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing. Jurisdictions which are eligible to receive federal funding from housing and community development programs administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are required to prepare a Consolidated Plan and Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing which outlines demographics,
jurisdictional analysis of impediments, conclusions and recommendations for fair housing activities. The *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing* is a planning document built on public participation and intergovernmental consultation.

The County of Alameda and the cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City along with the Housing Authorities for the Cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Livermore, Oakland and Alameda County have formed a working group to develop a regional *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing*.

The purpose of the Regional AI is to gather data and community feedback, identify specific impediments or barriers to fair housing within Alameda County, and then to come up with viable solutions, or actions to take against identified impediments.

In May 2020, the local jurisdictions will adopt a Five-Year Consolidated Plan. As part of the Consolidated Plan an *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI)* must be updated every five years. The last AI was updated in January 2015.

The *Draft Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing* is available to the public City of Berkeley webpage here: [https://www.cityofberkeley.info/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=36278](https://www.cityofberkeley.info/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=36278). The 45 day public review and comment period will end December 12, 2019.

If you have written comments, please mail or deliver them directly to Rhianna Babka, Housing & Community Services Department, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704.

Please contact Rhianna Babka at 510.981.5410 or rbabka@cityofberkeley.info to obtain additional information. Or call the City of Berkeley Health, Housing & Community Services Department at 981-5400. FAX: (510) 981-5450. TDD: (510) 981-6903.

**Accommodations Provided Upon Request.** To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the public hearing, 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. Providing at least three working days’ notice will help to ensure availability at the meeting.

Thank you,

**Rhianna Babka**
City of Berkeley
Housing and Community Services
2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-5410 (tel)
(510) 981-5450 (fax)
rbabka@ci.berkeley.ca.us

Please note: As a cost saving measure the City of Berkeley is closed the 2nd Friday of every month. Additional closures may occur. For the latest City Closures and Holidays please check the City of Berkeley Homepage at [www.ci.berkeley.ca.us](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us).

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This e-mail message including attachments, if any, is intended only for the person(s) or entity(ies) to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
MEMORANDUM

To: Housing Advisory Commission

From: Rhianna Babka, Community Service Specialist III

Date: October 23, 2019

Subject: Public Hearing on Community Needs

The City of Berkeley is an entitlement jurisdiction which receives federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds. This means that Berkeley receives an annual allocation of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds. As an entitlement jurisdiction, the City is required to prepare a Five-Year Consolidated Plan detailing how the City will spend all HUD funds.

The Consolidated Plan examines housing needs and establishes funding priorities in the areas of affordable housing and services for a wide range of low-income populations. In May 2020, Berkeley will submit the 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan to HUD. Prior to this submission, Berkeley will be gathering input from residents on community needs as well as sharing the draft Consolidated Plan in early 2020. On November 7, 2019, the HAC is hosting the first Berkeley public hearing to solicit community input on how Berkeley should allocate HUD funds. The purpose of this Public Hearing is to hear from Berkeley residents what services and housing are needed for low-income people in their communities.

City staff will also present information on accomplishments of projects supported with Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant, and HOME Investment Partnerships funding in Fiscal Year 2019.

Written comments may be submitted via email to Rhianna Babka rabanka@cityofberkeley.info or in person at 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704.
MEMORANDUM

To: Housing Advisory Commission
From: Rhianna Babka, Community Service Specialist III
Date: October 23, 2019
Subject: Public Hearing on Draft Regional Analysis of Impediments

Under the National Affordable Housing Act, localities which are eligible to receive federal funding from housing and community development programs administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are required to prepare an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) concurrently with the Consolidated Plan for the period covered under the Consolidated Plan.

The AI is a planning document regarding fair housing and is crafted with public participation. The purpose of the Regional AI is to gather data and community feedback, identify specific impediments or barriers to fair housing within the jurisdiction, and then to come up with viable solutions, or actions to take against identified impediments. Berkeley’s last AI was updated in 2015.

In May 2020, Berkeley will submit a Five-Year Consolidated Plan to HUD that is informed by an updated AI. For the AI that will inform Berkeley’s 2020 – 2025 Consolidated Plan, Berkeley has partnered with the County of Alameda and the cities of Alameda, Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City along with the Housing Authorities for the Cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Livermore, Oakland and Alameda County to form a working group to develop a Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing. The working group has hired Michael Baker International (MBI) to support the completion of the Regional AI.

Work on the Regional AI started in May 2019 and has included local stakeholder focus groups, three community engagement public meetings, an online survey, and data analysis of local and federal data. The work to date has culminated in a draft that is now available for your review at: https://www.cityofberkeley.info/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=36278
The draft Regional AI outlines prior fair housing efforts, regional demographics, contributing factors impacting fair housing, a housing analysis, and a disability and access analysis. The report concludes with a description of goals and actions that the region as a whole, and each jurisdiction, will take to reduce barriers to fair housing choice.

On November 7, 2019, the HAC is hosting the first Berkeley public hearing on the draft Regional AI. We are asking that both the HAC and the public review the draft document and provide feedback during this public hearing and open comment period. Comments will then be incorporated into the final Regional AI. The Berkeley public comment period is currently open and will end on December 12, 2019.

Written comments may be submitted via email to Rhianna Babka rbabka@cityofberkeley.info or in person at 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704.
Measure T1 Infrastructure Bond Program

UPDATE TO PARTICIPATING COMMISSIONS

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2019
Agenda

- Phase 1 Update
- Phase 2 Proposed Public Process
T1 Overview

- **Phase 1**
  - 2017 – 2021
  - June 2017 – Council approved list of 33 projects for Phase 1
  - November 2017 – $35 million bonds sold
    - $350,000 allocated for Public Art (1% of bond proceeds)
  - January 2018 - Council added to project list, authorizing up to $2 million for the Mental Health Services Center Renovation
  - March 2019 – Council approved an additional $5.3 million in funds for Phase 1
  - July 2019 – Council modification of T1 project list: Remove King School Park, adding 12 green infrastructure design projects
Visit our website!
https://www.cityofberkeley.info/MeasureT1

Project Updates

Community Meetings

Detailed Timelines

and more!
North Berkeley Senior Center

- Construction is in progress
- Anticipated to be completed in June 2020
Mental Health Services Center

- Construction is in progress
- Anticipated to be completed in June 2020.
Live Oak Community Center

- Groundbreaking held on October 29, 2019.
- Construction has started.
- Anticipated to be completed in October 2020.
Adeline Street and Hearst Avenue

- Construction is in progress
- Anticipated to be completed by Spring 2020.
University Ave., Spinnaker Way, Marina Blvd.

- Construction is anticipated to begin in the summer of 2020
Tom Bates Regional Sports Complex Completed
Citywide Irrigation System Completed

Before

After
# Phase 2 Public Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action/Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July – September 2019</td>
<td>Staff held meetings with P&amp;W/PW T1 Joint Subcommittee to develop timeline for Phase 2 public process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Staff presentation on public process to P&amp;W/PW Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November – December 2019</td>
<td>Update to participating commissions on Phase 1 progress and Phase 2 information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>Staff presentation to primary commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – March 2020</td>
<td>Neighborhood meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May – September 2020</td>
<td>Five large area meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>Online survey on Berkeley Considers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November – December 2020</td>
<td>Update to Participating Commissions and input on Phase 2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2020 – February 2021</td>
<td>Staff and commissions’ development of Phase 2 project list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Council approval and bond sale for Phase 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July – September 2019
Meetings with T1 Joint Subcommittee to develop Phase 2 Public Process Timeline

Goal:

*Develop an agreed-upon process by staff and subcommittee for Phase 2 Public Process.*

- Review proposed Measure T1 Phase 2 Public Process timeline with the T1 Joint Subcommittee
- Obtain feedback regarding Phase 2 Public Process
October 2019
Staff Presentations of Phase 2 Public Process to Primary Commissions

Goal:

Review Phase 2 public process from involved commissions.

- Review proposed Measure T1 Phase 2 Public Process timeline with the Parks & Waterfront and Public Works Commission
- Obtain feedback regarding Phase 2 Public Process
November – December 2019
Update to Participating Commissions

Goal:

Review Phase 2 public process from involved commissions.

- Review proposed Measure T1 Phase 2 Public Process timeline with the participating commissions
- Provide update on progress on Measure T1 Phase 1
January 2020
Staff presentations to Lead Commissions

Goal:

Review T1 quadrant maps and list of possible/feasible projects.

- Staff to present lists of projects based on need and separated by category (i.e streets, sidewalks, play structures etc.)
- Review maps of constructed and funded projects since 2014
February – October 2020
Online Feedback

Goal:

Provide an opportunity for community members who cannot attend neighborhood or geographic based meetings to share their feedback.

- February – September: Comments to T1@CityofBerkeley.info
- October: Survey on Berkeley Considers
February – March 2020
Neighborhood Meetings

Goal:

Obtain detailed feedback from groups in micro areas on potential projects.

- 15 – 20 group meetings as referred to by Councilmembers
- Other groups:
  - Business District Associations
  - Associated Sports Field Users
May – September 2020
5 large geographic-based meetings

Goal:
To reach all sectors of the City and obtain feedback on citywide or a specified area projects.

- Districts 5 & 6
- Districts 1 & 4 (excludes Waterfront)
- Districts 7 & 8
- Districts 2 & 3 (excludes Waterfront)
- Waterfront (includes Aquatic Park/ Tom Bates Field)
Goal:

Provide an update on Phase 1 progress and Phase 2 public process.

- Provide an update on progress on Measure T1 Phase 1
- Provide an update on Phase 2 public process
- Obtain input on Phase 2 projects
November 2020 – February 2021
Staff and Commissions’ development of Phase 2 Project List

Goal:

*Develop Phase 2 list of projects.*

- Staff and Commissions to review comments received from public process
- Staff and Commissions develop a list of Phase 2 projects based on public comments
June 2021
Council approval of Phase 2 Projects and Bond Sales

Goal:

Council approval of Phase 2 projects list.

- Staff and representatives from the Lead Commissions to present proposed list of projects for Phase 2 for Council’s approval
- Bond sales to follow later in the year
Thank you.

Questions?
MEMORANDUM

To: Housing Advisory Commission

From: Mike Uberti, Community Development Project Coordinator

Date: October 31, 2019

Subject: 2020 Housing Advisory Commission Proposed Meeting Dates

The Housing Advisory Commission (HAC) needs to adopt an annual meeting calendar for the 2020 calendar year. The HAC historically meets on the first Thursday of the month. The December meeting was moved to the second week of the month to account for holidays.

Please note: Meeting Room availability is limited. Any proposed changes will be subject to room availability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Thursday, 01/09/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Thursday, 02/06/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Thursday, 03/05/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Thursday, 04/02/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Thursday, 05/07/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Thursday, 06/04/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Thursday, 07/02/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Thursday, 09/03/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Thursday, 10/01/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Thursday, 11/05/20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Housing Advisory Commission

From: Mike Uberti, Community Development Project Coordinator

Date: October 31, 2019

Subject: Process for Officer Elections

Housing Advisory Commission (HAC) officer elections are held annually in February for the Chair and Vice-Chair. Information on the elections process and the roles of each office are detailed in the Commissioner's Manual.


The HAC adopted the following process guidelines for the 2019 elections:

- The commission will nominate candidates at the regular January meeting;
- The commission will adopt a panel of candidates by motion;
- All commissioners will vote by written ballot, which shall be read publicly by the Secretary; and
- In the event that no candidate receives the majority of the vote, the lowest candidates will be removed from eligibility and the commission will re-vote to select an officer.

City staff will provide ballots which shall be read publicly and recorded with each vote.

Commissioners are allowed to nominate themselves or a fellow appointed commissioner. Commissioners not nominated at the January meeting may still opt to include themselves or another commissioner prior to the balloting process for each position at the February meeting.
**HAC’s Discussion of Section 5 of the Draft Framework**

At the October HAC meeting, the commission took the following vote:

**Action:** M/S/C (Simon-Weisberg/Johnson) to recommend to City Council to adopt the Affordable Housing Framework, with the understanding that the Housing Advisory Commission intends to provide additional feedback on Section V of the report.


At the November meeting, the HAC needs to provide additional feedback on Section Five of the framework. The draft framework lists 15 subheadings under three larger categories. (See below.) Discussion will be centered on making recommendations specific to these three categories.

**Major Existing Programs - Recommend to Expand:**

- Constructing New Non-Profit Affordable Units
- Rent and Eviction Protections
- Affordable Housing Fees and Inclusionary Requirements for For-Profit Developments
- Direct Subsidies to Renters

**Additional Important Programs - Recommend to Significantly Expand:**

- House and Support the Homeless
- Transition some of Berkeley’s existing rental housing to permanently affordable social ownership by expanding the Small Sites Program, accompanied by a Tenant or Community Opportunity to Purchase Act.
- Provide innovative homeownership opportunities for moderate and low income residents, including cooperative ownership using the Community Land Trust model
- Significantly increase the supply of affordable live-work housing for artists and artisans.
- Encourage adding incremental units, such as accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or low-rise multiplex units that complement neighborhood character.
- Partner with UC Berkeley to support creation of housing appropriate and affordable to students, faculty and staff.
Policies to Ensure Equity and Sustainability:

- Ensure equitable access to scarce affordable housing, including accessible units with universal design features.
- Codify Deep Green Building standards for healthy and sustainable buildings, and emphasize other measures to increase environmental sustainability.
- Prioritize the use of public land for the creation of affordable housing.
- Ensure those who build and rehabilitate our housing are paid fair wages and have access to health insurance, and support local apprenticeship programs.
- Make changes to the City of Berkeley Zoning Code and project approvals processes to incentivize, facilitate and reward the production of affordable housing.

The complete report is available online:

To: Housing Advisory Commission
From: Commissioner Thomas Lord
Subject: Social Housing and Tenants Opportunity to Purchase

Recommendation

Motion: Hold a special meeting as described below on a date agreeable.

Fiscal Impacts of Recommendation

Staff time.

Current Situation and Effects

At our most recent Social Housing Subcommittee meeting, Commissioner Simon-Weisberg requested that the HAC consider holding a special meeting, in December, to hear an invited guest from the East Bay Community Law Center discuss a potential Tenants Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA) in connection to Social Housing. The suggestion was contingent upon the availability of the invited guest which was unknown at that time.

This item is a placeholder item, in case we now know such a guest is available.

Rationale for Recommendation

Example areas of potential interest to the HAC, from the standpoint of Social Housing policy, include (but are not limited to):

1. Can the proposed TOPA be used to remove residential rental properties from the general market?

2. Can a municipal housing trust purchase properties under TOPA, including properties with few or no tenants, or with tenants who are not interested in forming their own private coop?
To: Housing Advisory Commission  
From: Commissioner Thomas Lord  
Subject: Climate Emergency and Housing

Recommendation

By adoption, the Housing Advisory Commission would make the following recommendations to City Council, accompanying them with the other material in this memo.

Consistent with its duty to advise City Council on code enforcement priorities, on the prevention of homelessness, and on housing policies and related matters generally, the Housing Advisory Commission recommends that:

1. City Council reaffirm the California Efficiency Strategic Plan goal that all new residential construction will be net zero energy (ZNE) by 2020.\(^1\) The City should demand that all new construction be net zero energy by 2020, consistent with the findings reported by the IPCC in its Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C.\(^2\)

2. City Council establish a target of retrofitting all existing construction to be fossil free and NZE by 2030, again consistent with the findings of the IPCC.

3. City Council make and prioritize a referral to the City Manager to identify legal strategies to enforce NZE goals for new construction, or to require mitigation fees to be paid by new construction projects which are inconsistent with NZE goals.

4. City Council recognize that unreliability and possible long-term shut-offs of electricity and natural gas are made more likely both by the effects of already existing climate change, and by the urgency of rapidly reducing emissions from today’s levels; resilience in the face of such service losses is high desirable in the near term to prevent catastrophe-related homelessness and to better enable emissions mitigation.

5. City Council therefore help establish and empower people’s assemblies and task forces to further study the climate emergency and advise council on steps needed

---

\(^1\)See California Public Utilities Commission: https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/ZNE

\(^2\)See IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C section 4.3.2.2: https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/
both to rapidly and deeply mitigate Berkeley’s own emissions and to become more robust in adapting to climate change and adapting to rapid emissions mitigation’s.

**Fiscal Impacts of Recommendation**

Responding to the climate emergency will consume an unknown amount of staff time. These recommendations particularly call for staff time working on legislative strategies for achieving NZE goals, and for facilitating public assemblies.

**Current Situation and Effects**

Currently, the City of Berkeley Strategic Plan includes general goal #7:

7. *Be a global leader in addressing climate change and protecting the environment*

By making more explicit the needed NZE goals, this proposal would or would likely inform and intensify priorities:

- **7.3 Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings**
- **7.4 Clean Energy Microgrid**
- **7.7 Fuel Switching to Encourage Cleaner Energy**
- **7.11 Increased Rooftop Solar**

Currently, strategic goal 7 is flawed because it does not in any way prioritize three urgent needs:

1. The need to sharply and quickly reduce the emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gasses.
2. The need to adapt quickly to the consequences of such sharp reductions in emissions, which can not be achieved without quickly making sharp reductions in energy demand.
3. The need to adapt quickly to already-existing and near term climate changes, including abrupt and prolonged losses of basic infrastructure services, possibly resulting in housing insecurity.

Currently, strategic goal 7 is also flawed because it contains goal:

- **7.9 Increased Housing:** Identify options for removing barriers to creating more housing at all income levels.
As that goal is stated (and as Berkeley currently pursues it), the “streamlining” project will increase both local and regional emissions with no net reduction whatsoever. As stated, therefore, the project is incompatible with and contradictory to the strategic goal.

The recommendations in this referral would begin to correct goal 7.9, by incorporating appropriate NZE goals.

The recommendations in this referral would reinforce the importance of actually reducing emissions.

The recommendations in this referral would better align Berkeley’s adaptation tactics with already existing and near term climate change.

**Environmental Sustainability**

Berkeley is not presently on a sustainable or robust path, even in the near term, as recent events related to wildfire help to illustrate.

The recommendations in this referral aim to improve Berkeley’s posture and priorities by better aligning them with the consensus climate science represented by, for example, the IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C.

**Rationale for Recommendation**

According to the IPCC’s latest estimate, the global carbon budget remaining to limit warming to 1.5°C, with at most overshoot of that target for a sharply limited time, was 320 billion metric tons of CO$_2$ (or equivalent greenhouse gasses) as of January 1, 2018. Emissions since have been approximately 40 billion tons per year and continue at this pace. Thus, we will enter 2020 with a carbon budget of 240 billion tons CO$_2$ or less. On our current trajectory, this remaining emissions budget will be exhausted in about 6 years (i.e., by the end of 2025).³

Meanwhile, the Berkeley’s Climate Action Plan has generated a lot of activity. Nevertheless, According to the City’s own estimates, that activity has resulted in very little

---

³See IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, Chapter 2, particularly table 2.2 on page 108:
https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/

A 2018 budget of 320 aims at a (lowly) 2 in 3 chance of achieving the goal, and discounts the carbon budget by 100 billion tons to account for Earth system feedbacks (see column 4 in the table). For further information on interpreting the table, see “A new approach for understanding the remaining carbon budget”, published on the website http://carbonbrief.org by one of the primary IPCC editors for chapter 2, Dr. Joeri Rogelj:
https://www.carbonbrief.org/guest-post-a-new-approach-for-understanding-the-remaining-carbon-budget
emissions reduction relative to need; certainly not any reduction that is compatible with Paris goals.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{4}https://www.cityofberkeley.info/climate/
October 10, 2019

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Dear Mayor Arreguin and Members of the City Council,

I am writing on behalf of the Homeless Services Panel of Experts. The Council referred to us the “Housing for a Diverse, Equitable and Creative Berkeley: A Framework for Affordable Housing.” We reviewed this document at our October 2, 2019 meeting, discussing both the content of the Framework that we liked and support as well as areas that raised concerns or the Panel felt were insufficiently covered. At that meeting, the Panel took the following action:

**Action:** M/S/C cheema/Sutton to authorize the Chair to draft and refer a letter to Council to express feedback on behalf of the Commission regarding the policy framework.

**Vote:** *Ayes:* Carrasco, cheema, Gale, Jordan, Metz, Patil, Prado, Sutton.  
*Noes:* None.  
*Abstain:* None.  
*Absent:* Trotz.

The Panel provides the following feedback:

**Strengths of the Framework**

We know the solution to homelessness is housing and we support the promotion of more affordable housing. The Framework is strong in identifying the large and growing gap in affordable housing and many of the factors that contribute to this gap.

We also appreciate that it takes into account the new resources from Measures O, P and U1 and offers suggestions for how these can work together, encouraging coordination. As expressed in our statement of purpose, we support strong coordination between Measures O and P to ensure that significant new homeless-targeted units can be created with Measure O funds and made affordable and sustainable for people experiencing homelessness with support from Measure P.

We also support ensuring that housing in Berkeley is created to cover the *entire range of incomes*, including mixed income housing, as laid out in the Framework and we support the exploration of creative strategies such as expanding coops and cooperative land trusts, etc. that can increase the range of types of affordable units available.

**Concerns & Suggestions**

We have a deep concerns, however, that this Framework does not adequately address the lowest income population (including those with fixed incomes such as seniors and people with disabilities, and all with incomes at or below 15% of AMI). We do not see how it intends to address the current situation...
in which extremely low income people, and especially people of color who historically lived in Berkeley, cannot afford to live here.

Particularly, we did not see any meaningful or adequate way the Framework addresses the needs of people who are living in RV's or on the streets today or how they will have an affordable place to live as a result of this effort. **Without specific goals for addressing homeless people and communities, and prioritizing the creation of additional housing for those with the lowest incomes, we do not think the Framework’s overall intent to expand affordable housing will reach those with the highest need for housing.**

We support the suggestion that that developers create on-site inclusionary units and not just pay out fees, but we have grave concerns about allowing developers to focus those units exclusively on moderate income households. We believe that inclusionary units should include units for people at the lowest incomes as well, and this should be required.

Additional suggestions from the panel include:

- Provide greater detail about the impact of high construction costs, limited land availability and zoning barriers and zoning reform, to make clear what is needed to meet the goals in addition to funding alone.
- Include a greater discussion on the role of housing density, including determining whether greater density is needed to meet the goals and how that can be achieved.
- Include tiny homes as part of what could be considered for Auxiliary Dwelling Units, and in general as a creative strategy for additional housing.
- Incentivize the creation of housing that is permanently affordable.
- Incentivize the creation of buildings with common spaces that support community-building.
- Address the role of other City and public agencies in addressing the housing crisis as partners, including coordination with BUSD, the Health Department, Parks and Recreation, etc.
- Use the term Prevailing wage (rather than “Fair” wage.)

Thank you for your consideration of our feedback. We look forward to working with you to address Berkeley’s housing crisis and particularly to ensuring that people with the lowest incomes have a place to live in our community.

Sincerely,

Katharine Gale
Chair, Homeless Services Panel of Experts
Concerning the proposed housing template for Measure O, I have a few observations and suggestions.

“This framework addresses only Berkeley’s affordable and supportive housing strategies. Many strategies are already in place to support the creation of new market rate housing, and others are under consideration. Because the creation and preservation of affordable housing involves significant investments of City of Berkeley resources, a high-level, comprehensive framework, adopted by the City Council, is necessary to guide decision making by multiple entities over time.” (From the proposed framework)

This is problematic on a foundational level. A housing policy framework that deliberately ignores the crisis-level shortage of all types of housing in Berkeley is doomed to fail and to perpetuate city policies that discourage construction of housing for the “missing middle,” who don’t qualify for BMR units even if sufficient numbers could be built – i.e., our teachers, day care providers, school support staff, sanitation workers, parks department staff, public health workers, public health and safety personnel, retail clerks, restaurant servers – essentially the people who keep Berkeley running.

I fear that this is a calculated, cynical effort to hide behind the mask of support for affordable housing in order to throw monkey wrenches into policies that could have immediate effects in terms of infusing our housing supply with new, family-friendly units. Some of these policies, which should be baked into ANY housing framework for Berkeley are:

1. Elimination of parking requirements: we are long since past the era when cars needed houses as much as persons did; auto centric design increases the costs of units by tens of thousands of dollars; it also perpetuates the preferential treatment of private automobile use over shared vehicles, transit and walking and biking.
2. Elimination of single-family-housing zoning in Berkeley: this leftover from the days of redlining and racial covenants is also a throwback to a vision of a semi-suburban city that is nearly a century out of date. Density not only is desirable from an equity, environmental and fiscal point of view, but from the point of view of revivifying the urban fabric with residents of all ages, families, walkable neighborhoods and soft transportation options readily to hand.
3. Creation of pre-approved templates for converting single-family lots for the following development options: a) ADUs; b)duplex, triplex and fourplex etc. c) replications of other multi-unit structures that were permitted in the past (cf. apartment buildings now roughly from Spruce east to the hills). Many cities have done this already, so this shouldn’t be difficult to develop.
4. Codification of “affordable by design” guidelines in the City’s zoning and building codes, e.g., Regulate building density by height, bulk and setback requirements, not by limits on the number of units allowed or bedrooms; Stop requiring parking in new buildings; Stop regulating bedroom counts. Enable a greater range of wood-frame buildings to be constructed by allowing housing at the ground floor of podium buildings and greater flexibility in the code to facilitate a fifth story of wood-frame construction. Allow developers to fulfill their inclusionary housing requirement by providing a greater percentage of their units at middle-income price points. Modify requirements for courtyard widths and rear-yard setbacks to allow for greater design flexibility in locating common open space.
5. Impact analysis on all current and future development fees to determine the optimal amounts to be charged, while still allowing construction to proceed at a pace that will address our housing crisis. Perhaps put a moratorium on some fees for a window of time to jump start development.

6. Establishment of an overall annual housing creation goal to be used as a benchmark to determine where in the approval process there are barriers that slow or cripple development and take steps to remove them.

7. Restriction of the types of developments that can be taken before the ZAB to avoid frivolous harassment that leads to costly delays and even abandonment of projects.

8. Improved coordination among the various arms of city government that hold approval power over development: Fire and Safety, Zoning, Building, Health et al. often have conflicting concerns.

“Diversity is one of Berkeley’s key strengths.” [From the proposed framework]

Under the current policies, Berkeley has become strikingly LESS diverse and has abrogated its responsibility to respond to the needs of our region. While the nine-county Bay Area’s population has grown 36% since 1970 (using figures from the 2010 census), Berkeley’s population has remained stagnant or may have even DECREASED in that time. It is time the city that prides itself on inclusiveness step up and lower the drawbridge and let people in. It is disingenuous, to say the least, to attribute the rise in rents and home prices to the influx of new jobs and students without noting the fact that the actual number of people living in Berkeley has remained stagnant, because not enough new housing has been built.

“The question before us is whether we will let market forces decide who can reside in Berkeley, ultimately reserving it for those with high incomes and wealth, or whether we want to reshape the market so Berkeley can remain accessible to people of all backgrounds and incomes, who are essential to the life and vibrancy of our city.” [From the proposed housing framework]

Since the city has clamped down on new housing for decades, it would seem odd to demonize market forces. Perhaps if market forces had been allowed to exert themselves somewhat over the past 50 years, Berkeley’s population growth would have kept up with the Bay Area’s.

In conclusion, I am convinced that many of the Berkeley voters who supported Measure O would be very uncomfortable with much of rhetoric and the overall approach expressed in this framework.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Orrick
West Berkeley

Attachments enclosed
# City of Berkeley

Alameda County

## Decennial Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In excel:</td>
<td>1890-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census 2000</th>
<th>Census 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>102,743</td>
<td>112,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group quarters</td>
<td>96,921</td>
<td>99,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>12,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census 2000</th>
<th>Census 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60,797</td>
<td>66,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>14,007</td>
<td>11,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16,837</td>
<td>21,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>4,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>6,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of Berkeley
## Alameda County

### Decennial Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In excel:</td>
<td>1890-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Census 2000 vs Census 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census 2000</th>
<th>Census 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>102,743</td>
<td>112,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group quarters</td>
<td>96,921</td>
<td>99,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60,797</td>
<td>66,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>14,007</td>
<td>11,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16,837</td>
<td>21,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>4,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>6,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Decennial Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In excel:</td>
<td>1890-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1970 Census vs 1980 Census vs 1990 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970 Census</th>
<th>1980 Census</th>
<th>1990 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td>116,716</td>
<td>103,328</td>
<td>102,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79,041</td>
<td>69,129</td>
<td>64,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>27,421</td>
<td>20,671</td>
<td>19,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79,041</td>
<td>69,129</td>
<td>64,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27,421</td>
<td>20,671</td>
<td>19,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Berkeley

**Alameda County**

### Decennial Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In excel:</td>
<td>1890-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1970 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79,041 (67.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>27,421 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1980 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69,129 (66.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20,671 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1990 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64,002 (62.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19,309 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Council members and Housing Advisory Commissioners,

Please see the attached letter addressing the evaluation and reduction of parking spaces at the affordable housing development-- Maudelle Miller Shirek Community at 2001 Ashby Avenue. The evaluation of parking was required with the HAC’s recommendation of RCD’s predevelopment loan request to City Council.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this letter

Best,
Nicole

Nicole Brown | Project Manager
Resources for Community Development
2220 Oxford Street | Berkeley, CA 94704
RCDHOUSING.ORG | 510 841 4410 x340
Berkeley City Council and Housing Advisory Commission  
2180 Milvia St,  
Berkeley, CA 94703

October 29th, 2019

Subject: Predevelopment Fund Request for 2001 Ashby

Dear City Council and the Housing Advisory Commission,

Please approve the request for $1,200,000 in additional predevelopment funds to enable Resources for Community Development to buy 2001 Ashby Avenue from the Cooperative Center Federal Credit Union. RCD has reevaluated and reduced the number of parking spaces, as required by the Housing Advisory Commission. This letter explains the reduction that RCD is now proposing.

Maudelle Miller Shirek Community at 2001 Ashby Avenue will include 87 affordable apartments available to households earning 20-80% of the Area Median Income, 2,000 square feet of nonprofit designated commercial space and amenities including a community room, landscaped courtyard, on-site laundry, offices for resident services and property management. Over half of the apartments in this development will be 2 and 3-bedroom units and overall this community could house up to 157 individuals. Our priority first and foremost is to provide housing for low income households and individuals.

After an evaluation of the parking provided at other RCD properties in Berkeley, Oakland and other affordable housing developments in the East Bay in close proximity to transit, we have reduced the total parking on-site from 54 spaces to 45 parking spaces. This is a 17% reduction in on-site parking. This results in an overall parking ratio of 0.52 parking spaces per apartment. The zoning at this location requires 2 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial space, resulting in 4 spaces required for the commercial space. Additionally 3 parking spaces will be dedicated to resident services and property management staff. This results in 38 parking spaces that will be available for residents. This number is sufficient to offer one parking space to each of the 2 and 3-bedroom households, who are more likely to own a car.

Many of the residents in our existing properties in close proximity to transit do own cars, which are often necessary to reach lower-wage jobs that are not located on BART lines or other major transit lines. The number of vehicles owned by residents may exceed the number of parking spaces that are available on-site and this creates a waiting list for available parking at our properties. Currently at RCD properties Oxford Plaza in Downtown Berkeley (40 resident parking spaces for 97 apartments) and Fox Courts in Downtown Oakland (68 resident parking spaces for 80 apartments) there are waitlists for available parking.
2001 Ashby is in an amenity rich walkable neighborhood with various options for transit but the complete elimination of on-site parking is currently not feasible due to resident needs. Most of the 45 parking spaces will be mechanical parking stackers. The number of parking stackers can be reevaluated while the property is in operation to possibly reduce the number of parking spaces by removing the stackers when they are no longer needed.

This development concept and design prioritizes the needs of our future residents and nonprofit commercial tenants. RCD developed this with direct input from experienced staff and community partners as well as experience from existing properties. Significant thought has gone into how this development will be an environmentally sustainable development while providing housing for low income families.

Thank you for your consideration and support. The City of Berkeley's commitment of this request will enable RCD to buy the site this fall, before the purchase agreement expires and move toward start of construction in mid-2021 with completion in early 2023.

Sincerely,

Nicole Brown
Project Manager