



Rent Stabilization Board  
Office of the Executive Director

DATE: February 14, 2017

TO: Honorable Members of the Berkeley City Council

FROM: John Selawsky, Chairperson  
Jay Kelekian, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **Support for *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

---

### **BACKGROUND**

For the past several months, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Program staff have been providing technical support to a group of organizations and individuals developing proposals around an Anti-Displacement Funding and Policy Plan for Alameda County. The most recent iteration of the draft proposal is attached, and lists 26 organizations, including the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Program, that have been involved in drafting, advising, or providing feedback on the draft plan. Feedback from several other organizations is pending.

The draft plan was presented to the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board at its February 6, 2017 Regular Meeting. The Board voted unanimously to endorse the draft plan and ongoing efforts to develop a county-wide anti-displacement funding and policy plan. M/S/C: Townley/Laverde-Levine, 7-0-0-1 (Soto-Vigil absent).

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Board encourages the City Council to endorse the draft plan and the ongoing efforts to develop a county-wide anti-displacement funding and policy plan.

Attachment: 12 Page Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan dated February 2, 2017

**Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

February 2, 2017

To: Supervisor Keith Carson

Aisha Brown, Policy Aide, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office

Linda Gardner, Director, Alameda County Housing & Community Development Dept

Fr: Margaretta Lin, Dellums Institute for Social Justice

Please see attached for our collective impact recommendations for how Alameda County funds and leverage could be used to solve the County's displacement crisis:

1. That the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, Oakland, Berkeley, and Hayward Mayor and City Council pass new resolutions to use new County and City Housing funds to advance the below *Our Beloved Community* anti-displacement priorities.
2. That the Alameda County Board of Supervisors pass a resolution to 1) use County Housing Boomerang funds for anti-displacement priorities; and 2) as the local match requirement for County Housing Bond funds, require Cities to either contribute local housing funds to the County OR fund local anti-displacement priorities.
3. That the County Board of Supervisors pass critical *Our Beloved Community* anti-displacement policies which are within its jurisdictional ability.
4. That the County Board of Supervisors incentivize Cities who want access to the County regional housing development funds (\$200 million) to have effective anti-displacement policies, including best practice policies set forth below.

These recommendations were crafted based upon critical feedback from and the expertise of anti-displacement leaders from the following organizations:

1. ACCE
2. Alameda County Public Health Dept
3. Arts for a Better Bay Area
4. Bay Area Community Land Trust
5. Berkeley Juneteenth Cultural Celebrations
6. Berkeley NAACP
7. Causa Justa::Just Cause
8. Centro Legal de la Raza
9. Church By The Side of the Road, Berkeley
10. City Councilmember Ben Bartlett, Berkeley
11. City of Berkeley Rent Board
12. Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
13. East Bay Asian Local Development Corp
14. East Bay Community Law Center

**Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

15. East Oakland Building Healthy Communities
16. EastSide Arts Alliance
17. EBHO
18. Everyone Home
19. Friends of Adeline, Berkeley
20. Glad Tidings Church, Hayward
21. Oakland Grown
22. Oakland Heritage Alliance
23. Pastors of Oakland
24. PolicyLink
25. UC Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy
26. Youth Spirit Artworks

Critical feedback from other organizations is pending, including from Alameda Renters Coalition, Allen Temple Baptist Church, APEN, Berkeley Organizing Congregants for Action (BOCA), Oakland Community Land Trust, OCO, Oakland Tenants Union, and Urban Habitat.

We greatly appreciate your leadership to solve the untenable urban displacement and racial justice crisis confronting Alameda County. We remain committed to serving as your partners.

## **Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

### **OUR BELOVED COMMUNITY VISION AND GOALS:**

We seek to continue Dr. King's legacy and vision for creating "Beloved Community" in Alameda County in which,

*"All people can share in the wealth of the earth. In the Beloved Community, poverty, hunger and homelessness will not be tolerated because international standards of human decency will not allow it. Racism and all forms of discrimination, bigotry and prejudice will be replaced by an all-inclusive spirit of sisterhood and brotherhood."<sup>1</sup>*

Our ability to create the *Beloved Community* is severely undermined by the displacement crisis in Alameda County. We see critical opportunities to solve this crisis and believe the following goals are attainable through a uniting of community dedication and political will:

1. Enable every long-time resident who wants to stay and contribute to have access to new resources for tenants and homeowners.
2. Ensure that new County and City housing funds are being utilized for anti-displacement strategies.
3. Redeploy available local flexible funds to address funding gaps for major anti-displacement strategies.
4. Enact significant protective anti-displacement policies at the County, City, and State levels.

### **WHY WE NEED ANTI-DISPLACEMENT STRATEGIES IN ADDITION TO BUILDING MORE HOUSING**

- It takes time to build, i.e. 3-5 years, and people are being displaced at an escalated rate. The long-term effort to build more permanently affordable housing needs to be paired with more immediate assistance for people at risk of losing their homes.
- Funds and capacity for affordable housing development, while given an important boost by Measure A1, do not meet the need on their own. Looking at just very low and extremely low income households, Alameda County has a shortfall of 58,680 units—which would require public subsidy of over \$5.8 billion.
- The prevalent affordable housing development model is dependent on funding streams that provide one-time subsidies to build housing primarily for very low and low income households, but often aren't paired with the ongoing rental assistance needed for deep affordability. As a result, it provides only a limited supply of new housing for homeless people, extremely low income people, middle class, etc.
- Affordable rental housing, while important for economic and neighborhood stability, does not on its own address the racial wealth-stripping crisis that affects owner-occupied housing and small businesses.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.thekingcenter.org/king-philosophy-sub4>

**Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

**ALAMEDA COUNTY DISPLACEMENT PROBLEM STATEMENT<sup>2</sup>**

1. **Housing unaffordability:** Increasing gap between housing costs and incomes of long-time residents.
  - I.e. renters making the median household income would have to pay 114% of their income to afford new rents in Berkeley; 93% in Oakland; and 69% in Hayward.
2. **Market pressures on some landlords to induce lower rent tenants to move:** harassment; financial pay-out; less flexibility with late rent; delay repairs.
  - i.e. In 2016, there were about 8,551 notices of eviction filed with the City of Oakland; some of these did not result in an actual eviction and some tenants are constructively evicted without a formal eviction notice filed.
3. **Long-time homeowners losing their homes:** Increasing gap between housing costs and fixed incomes; predatory lending targeting homeowners of color; neighborhood targeting by real estate sharks.
  - Over 35,000 Alameda County homeowners are paying over 50% of their income towards housing; over 18,000 are very low income and over 7,500 are very low income and seniors.
  - Property tax default data analysis pending.
4. **Domino market dynamics impact most vulnerable people:** homeless, formerly incarcerated, elderly and disabled, youth, single parents with children.
  - A recent UCSF study showed that significant numbers of homeless seniors became homeless due to housing unaffordability.
  - Oakland's children population declined 16.7% from 2000 to 2010, with only a 3.9% decline in the County.
  - Recent studies show the direct correlation between housing stability and recidivism.
5. **Persistent racism including in housing, employment, and lending results in disparate impacts on African Americans, certain neighborhoods and cities**
  - In the cities in Alameda County with growing economic prosperity, the African American population has been severely reduced from 2000 to 2015.
    - Berkeley lost 5,040 African Americans, a 37% decline.
    - Oakland lost 36,559 African Americans, a 26% decline.
  - Berkeley, Oakland, and Piedmont are the top cities in the County with the largest gap between median income and market rate rents and the only cities that experienced a decline in the African American population from 2000 to 2015.
  - The economic recovery in Alameda County has been racially uneven with the White and Asian populations seeing the largest gains in income recovery from 1999 to 2011-15 compared to the median incomes of the African American and Latino populations.

---

<sup>2</sup> The following is a summary of some relevant data and additional information will be available in the final report.

## Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

- **Berkeley:** median income for White and Asian households increased by \$2,410 and \$13,732, respectively, at the same time that median income for African American and Latino households decreased by \$13,570 and \$2,094, respectively.
  - **Hayward:** median income for White and Asian households declined by \$3,191 and \$1,551, respectively, at the same time that median income for African American and Latino households decreased by \$20,678 and \$14,728, respectively.
  - **Oakland:** median income for White household increased by \$6,206 at the same time that median income for African American, Latino, and Asian households decreased by \$8,152, \$9,199, and \$4,286, respectively.
  - The foreclosure crisis was concentrated in working class communities of color with the greatest impact in East and West Oakland, South Berkeley, Ashland, and Hayward's Harder-Tennyson and surrounding neighborhoods.<sup>3</sup> Foreclosures of primarily single family homes resulted in destabilized housing with the conversion of affordable homeownership into market rate rentals. Today, these neighborhoods are either in advanced gentrification, undergoing displacement, or at risk of displacement.<sup>4</sup>
  - In addition, while the homeownership rate for households has declined in the County by 2% from 2000 to 2011-15, the decline rate for African American households has been the largest at 5.2% compared to Asian (3% increase), White (1.8% decline), and Latino (4.9% decline). This racial disparity is reflected in the following cities:
    - **Berkeley:** total homeownership rate (no change); African American at 6.2% decline compared to Asian (3.2% increase), White (no change), and Latino (no change).
    - **Hayward:** total homeownership rate (no change); African American at 5.7% decline compared to Asian (12.1% increase), White (no change), and Latino (4.4% decline)
    - **Oakland:** total population homeownership rate decline of 1.7%; African American at 2.9% decline compared to Asian (no change), White (1.7% decline), and Latino (2.5% decline).
  - Recent studies show that racial discrimination in lending continue today.<sup>5</sup>
  - Bay Area job growth is concentrated in the high wage tech and other professional industries and low wage service industries. Recent lawsuits and studies point to racial disparity and discrimination in the tech industry.<sup>6</sup>
- 6. There are no protections for legacy business, cultural artist, and nonprofit employers**
- State law prohibits local governments from passing commercial rent protections. Commercial rents have been escalating and forcing the displacement of long-time neighborhood serving small businesses, cultural arts groups, and nonprofits who also employ local residents, including youth. Comparison rent data is pending.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.acphd.org/media/53643/foreclose2.pdf>, page 17.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.urbandisplacement.org/map/sf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://urbanstrategies.org/download/locked-out-of-the-market-poor-access-to-home-loans-for-californians-of-color/>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.forbes.com/sites/bonniemarcus/2015/08/12/the-lack-of-diversity-in-tech-is-a-cultural-issue/#4fdc30323577>; <http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2017/01/labor-department-sues-oracle-for-racial-discrimination/>; <https://techcrunch.com/2016/09/26/u-s-department-of-labor-sues-palantir-for-racial-discrimination/>.

**Summary of Our Beloved Community\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation 1: We advocate that the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, Oakland, Berkeley, & Hayward Mayor and City Council pass new resolutions to use new County & City Housing funds to advance the below Our Beloved Community anti-displacement priorities.**

Alameda County and the Cities of Berkeley, Hayward, and Oakland have a total of **\$703.2 million** available in the next 5 years or so in new funds for affordable housing:

- **Alameda County:** \$580 million in Housing Bond funds restricted to acquisition, building or rehabilitation work per State law.

Homeowner Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$50M Allocation for Down-payment Assistance Loan</li> <li>• Goal: to assist middle-income working families to purchase homes and stay in Alameda County.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$25M Allocation for Homeowner Housing Development</li> <li>• Goal: to assist in the development of housing, improve the long-term affordability of housing for low-income households, and help first-time homebuyers stay in the county.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$45M Allocation for Home Preservation Revolving Loan Fund</li> <li>• Goal: to help seniors, people with disabilities, and other low-income homeowners to remain safely in their homes. Provides small loans to pay for accessibility improvements, such as ramps, widened doorways, and grab bars. Provides rehabilitation loans for deferred maintenance such as roofs, plumbing, and electrical systems to seniors/people with disabilities/low-income households at 80% of area median income.</li> </ul>
Rental Housing Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$425M Allocation for Rental Housing Development</li> <li>• Goal: to create and preserve affordable rental housing for vulnerable populations, including lower-income workforce housing. Developments will remain affordable over the long term—estimated to be for at least 55 years.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$35M Allocation for Innovation &amp; Opportunity Fund</li> <li>• Goal: to respond quickly to capture opportunities that arise in the market to preserve and expand affordable rental housing and/or prevent tenant displacement—e.g. rapid response, high-opportunity predevelopment and site acquisition loans.</li> </ul>
<p>*Funding will be allocated throughout Alameda County. Homeowner program funds and rental innovation program funds to be allocated countywide.</p>

- **City of Oakland:** \$100 million in Infrastructure Bond funds restricted to acquisition, building or rehabilitation work per State law. City ordinance prioritizes acquisition & rehabilitation: 1) purchase/rehab rental housing; 2) purchase/rehab ownership housing; 3) blighted vacant land purchase for rental or ownership; 4) homeowner assistance; 5) new construction.
- **City of Berkeley:** \$3-3.4 million annually in Measure U1 tax, flexible use under ballot measure language.
- **City of Hayward:** \$8 million of flexible local housing funds currently uncommitted.

## **Summary of Our Beloved Community\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

### **Our Beloved Community Recommendations for New Housing Bond and Other Housing Funds**

1. **Prioritize impacted neighborhoods:** Prioritize housing funds for neighborhoods at high risk of displacement, especially of African Americans, including Transit Oriented Corridors, or with concentrations of homeless encampments. The UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Map can be utilized as one tool.
2. **Prioritize impacted people:** Support the 20% set-aside for extremely low income. Alameda County Bond program description includes a target that at least 20% of the rental housing units be reserved for extremely low income households, at or below 20% AMI. The City of Oakland bond measure ordinance includes a commitment of 20% of funds to be used for extremely low income residents, at or below 30% AMI. We support the Sanctuary City framework for ensuring access to housing opportunities.
3. **Prioritize anti-displacement of community institutions:** Prioritize funds for partnerships with faith and other community centers serving memberships with high rates of displacement, especially African Americans, to help prevent community center displacement. For example, EBHO has a program matching faith institutions with nonprofit housing developers.
4. **Prioritize details/terms in new funds to prevent further or redress racial wealth-stripping, such as:**
  - a. **County (\$45 million) & City of Oakland Home Preservation Fund** for low income homeowners should include terms to facilitate **heirs to keep and live in homes**—loan not to be repaid until income eligible (80% AMI or below) and owner-occupant heirs sell the property.
  - b. **County (\$425 million) and City of Oakland (\$100 million) Rental Housing Development** projects should include **long-term affordable commercial rents** or **co-ownership** opportunities for neighborhood-serving small businesses, cultural artists, and nonprofits in commercial components of housing projects.
  - c. **County Homeowner Housing Development (\$25 million) and Down Payment Assistance (\$50 million)** should prioritize **people who lost their homes** (including those who moved out of County) or have been **long-time residents** in the County.
  - d. **County Innovation Fund (\$35 million) & City of Berkeley** to include **rental housing rehabilitation funds**, including utility meter rehab, for income eligible small landlords in exchange for long-term rent affordability terms (per City of Oakland Bond term).
5. **Use power of money:** County to require all Cities who want to receive County Housing funds to fund anti-displacement measures—see Recommendation II.
6. **Public transparency:** Provide **quarterly public reports** and ensure that new **Oversight Committee** includes faith, community leaders for effective funding implementation.



## Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

**Recommendation 2: We advocate that the Alameda County Board of Supervisors pass a resolution to 1) use County Housing Boomerang funds for anti-displacement priorities; and 2) as the local match requirement for County Housing Bond funds, require Cities to either contribute local housing funds to the County OR fund local anti-displacement priorities.<sup>7</sup>**

In response to community and faith advocacy, the Board of Supervisors' adopted resolution on the County Housing Bond includes a WHEREAS clause prioritizing local County affordable housing development funds to be used to prevent displacement. This placeholder language championed by Supervisor Chan still requires Board adoption. In addition, Supervisor Carson at that meeting introduced a motion that the local match requirement for affordable housing development projects receiving County Housing Bond funds be used to fund anti-displacement priorities. This motion was not at that time passed by the Board.

A 25% local match of just the City designated funds of \$225 million including the County housing boomerang funds, would provide \$16.25-\$18.75 million annually for critical anti-displacement priorities. We advocate that cities with severe displacement, such as Oakland and Berkeley, provide a 35% local match to fund anti-displacement priorities, which would provide an additional \$1.4 million annually. Our analysis of the annual affordable housing development funds from local sources such as housing boomerang and local housing fees shows that \$48-61 million is available annually County-wide, including County housing boomerang funds. See Table 1.

1. For cities with a severe displacement crisis like Oakland and Berkeley, we recommend using local flexible funds for priority anti-displacement such as Oakland's Measure JJ implementation, a coordinated anti-displacement action teams and one-stop centers including outreach and referral, universal legal defense services and housing counseling for tenants, homeowners, churches, legacy businesses, and community buying program.
  - I.e. the Oakland program served over 4,000 tenants and homeowners in targeted neighborhoods in 3 years. The coordination and outreach work are no longer funded.
  - Preservation of existing tenancies for low-income Alameda County residents is the most cost-effective way to build and maintain our *Beloved Community*. Social scientists across the country, including Prof. Matthew Desmond of Harvard, have shown that the most effective intervention to preserve existing tenancies is legal representation in eviction proceedings (known as unlawful detainer in California). Approximately 3,000 unlawful detainers are filed in Alameda County each year with many landlords represented by paid counsel. We estimate that the tenant legal representation gap is 2,116 cases. \$2.77 million would fund the existing tenant legal representation gap County-wide. In addition, housing counseling and education services are critical components to a

---

<sup>7</sup> Some Alameda County cities currently use their local housing funds for rental assistance or home preservation. Other cities may need to amend their local policies or programs to facilitate their local housing funds to be used for immediate anti-displacement priorities.

## **Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

wholistic tenant anti-displacement model and would cost about **\$300,000** to meet Oakland's gap needs.

2. We recommend that the County and Cities contribute funds for an impactful **County-wide Home Preservation Revolving Loan Fund** for low-income distressed homeowners operated by group of existing and effective community loan servicers to provide 0%-low interest loans (~\$7 million annually).
  - The example of the Oakland program for distressed homeowners provided up to \$50,000 per eligible household. \$7 million annually could help at least 140 elderly homeowners annually OR be used to leverage 0%-2% interest funds from banks and foundations.
3. County and Cities contribute funds for impactful **County-wide Emergency Rental Assistance Grants** for low-income tenants operated by existing groups (~\$5 million annually).
  - We have examples of the current Catholic Charities and Oakland program providing up to \$5,000 per household. \$5 million annually could help at least 1,000 households annually.
4. County and Cities contribute additional funds for **Coordinated Entry** system and **Rapid Re-housing** grants and services for homeless and homeless prevention (~\$5 million annually).
  - Current funds are serving 3-5% of the homeless population.

### **Recommendation 3: We advocate that the County Board of Supervisors pass critical anti-displacement policies:**

1. Protections in eviction process for people with health risks—legal analysis is pending.
2. Rent stabilization & just cause eviction laws for the estimated 18,179 tenants residing in the unincorporated areas.
3. Protections for seniors and disabled homeowners in property tax default—the County should partner with service providers to conduct outreach and refer them to services and resources. The County should take all discretionary steps possible to avoid tax foreclosure of lower income, elderly and disabled owner-occupied homeowners.
4. Remove barriers to all publicly subsidized housing for formerly incarcerated residents, following recent City of Richmond enacted law.
5. Provide property tax reductions for small income eligible landlords in exchange for long-term rental affordability requirements.
6. Prioritize public lands for 100% affordable housing (when housing feasible) or strong community benefits in commercial and industrial development including local hire, living

## Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

wage, and affordable commercial rents for neighborhood serving businesses, cultural artists, and nonprofits.

7. Address discriminatory hiring in tech firms by conducting an annual report of outcomes from hiring and efforts to remove barriers using current company Corporate/Social Responsibility reports.
8. Advocate for major State law changes:
  - a. Repeal Costa Hawkins that constrains local governments from enacting effective rent stabilization protections.
    - A number of cities in California have passed resolutions supporting Costa Hawkins changes.
    - A recent study shows that local rent laws in California prevented the displacement of lower income renters, including people of color; Costa Hawkins did not result in its stated goals and has been a major factor in the urban displacement crisis.
    - i.e. About 44% of Oakland's rental housing stock is unable to be covered by local law because of State constraints.
  - b. Repeal State law prohibiting local commercial rent stabilization
  - c. Provide protections in eviction process for elderly & disabled & school-aged children homeowners and tenants.

**Recommendation 4: We advocate that the County Board of Supervisors incentivize Cities who want access to the County regional housing development funds (\$200 million) to have effective anti-displacement policies, including the below best practice policies.**

Many of the below policies have been identified by County Housing staff as anti-displacement policies. We have included other best practice or innovative policies. We also recommend that the County require Cities to present at an annual County public hearing on 1) outcomes of the use of County Bond funds; 2) their steps to prevent displacement and the outcomes.

1. Rent stabilization laws, including for mobile homes if applicable
2. Strong condo conversion protections
3. Just Cause eviction protections for both tenants and former homeowners post-foreclosure
4. Ellis Act eviction protections
5. Remove barriers to publicly subsidized housing for formerly incarcerated residents, following recent City of Richmond law

**Summary of *Our Beloved Community*\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding  
& Policy Plan**

*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

6. Public lands policy requiring 100% affordable housing or commercial including for cultural artists
7. SRO preservation
8. Displacement impact nexus study and mitigation requirements from market rate projects over X units
9. Local hire for both publicly subsidized projects AND projects requiring land use and zoning changes
10. Living wage ordinance for publicly subsidized projects
11. Cultural preservation district policy integrating community governance, financing, and land use and zoning powers
12. Seismic retrofit requirements for at-risk rental housing with strong anti-displacement including rent increase caps and funds for income eligible landlords
13. Tenant opportunity to purchase housing units about to be sold, such as the recent Washington DC policy.
14. Regulate short-term rental housing units to prevent loss of rental housing stock.
15. Policies that address employers who are exacerbating the housing crisis due to their economic development model.

**Summary of Our Beloved Community\* Proposal: Alameda County Anti-Displacement Funding & Policy Plan**  
*A Trickle Up Methodology Advancing Racial & Social Justice*

**Table 1. Affordable Housing Development Funds**

City	Designated County Funds for Affordable Housing Development (2017-2021)	Access to other County Affordable Housing Development Funds (2017-2021)	25% Local Match <sup>8</sup> for Anti-Displacement Priorities	Annual Local Match over 5 years	Estimated Annual Local Flexible Affordable Housing Development Funds <sup>9</sup>
City of Alameda	\$ 10,370,727	\$49,803,134 pool	\$2.6 mm	\$518,536	\$3 mm
City of Albany	\$2,588,918	\$89,325,065 pool	\$650,000	\$129,445	?
City of Berkeley	\$15,796,369	\$89,325,065 pool	\$4 mm	\$789,818	\$1 mm + \$3.3 mm
City of Dublin	\$8,831,465	\$27,332,372 pool	\$2.2 mm	\$441,573	\$7.5 mm
City of Emeryville	\$2,799,109	\$89,325,065 pool	\$700,000	\$139,955	\$1.3 mm
City of Fremont	\$33,264,459	\$33,539,429 pool	\$8.3 mm	\$1.66 mm	\$12.3 mm
City of Hayward	\$20,298,294	\$49,803,134 pool	\$5 mm	\$1 mm	\$8 mm <sup>10</sup>
City of Livermore	\$12,722,700	\$27,332,372 pool	\$3.2 mm	\$636,135	\$4.5 mm
City of Newark	\$6,029,275	\$33,539,429 pool	\$1.5 mm	\$301,464	\$106,000
City of Oakland	\$54,803,565	\$89,325,065 pool	\$13.7 mm	\$2.74 mm	\$4-6 mm + \$6 mm <sup>11</sup>
City of Piedmont	\$2,431,300	\$89,325,065 pool	\$608,000	\$121,565	\$0
City of Pleasanton	\$13,720,684	\$27,332,372 pool	\$3.43 mm	\$686,034	\$430,000
City of San Leandro	\$11,907,775	\$49,803,134 pool	\$3 mm	\$595,389	\$295,000
Unincorporated County	\$19,671,892	\$49,803,134 pool	\$4.9 mm	\$983,594	?
City of Union City	\$9,763,468	\$33,539,429 pool	\$2.44 mm	\$488,173	\$1 mm
County of Alameda			\$25-37.5 mm <sup>12</sup>	\$5-7.5 mm	\$5-7.5 mm
<b>Alameda County Total</b>	<b>\$225,000,000</b>	<b>\$200,000,000</b>	<b>\$81.25-\$93.75 mm</b>	<b>\$16.25-\$18.75 mm</b>	<b>\$48mm-\$61 mm</b>

<sup>8</sup> 25% of designated County funds for specific cities.

<sup>9</sup> Sources of funds include housing boomerang and local fees such as housing impact, Inclusionary Zoning in-lieu, commercial linkage. Information based upon review of recent budgets and/or interviews with City staff.

<sup>10</sup> The City of Hayward currently has \$8 million available in uncommitted local housing funds. City staff analysis on future revenues from its new housing impact fee is pending.

<sup>11</sup> The City of Oakland's new housing impact fee began in September 2016 and is estimated to generate \$60.8 million over 10 years.

<sup>12</sup> The \$25-37.5 million is based upon Alameda County housing boomerang funds over 5 years.