



ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

Chris Bazar
Agency Director

Linda M. Gardner
Housing Director

224 West Winton Ave
Room 108

Hayward, California
94544-1215

phone
510.670.5404

fax
510.670-6378

TTY
510.265.0253

www.acgov.org/cda

TO: Supervisor Wilma Chan
Supervisor Keith Carson
Board of Supervisors Health Committee – Subcommittee on Housing

FROM: Chris Bazar, Director, Community Development Agency
Linda Gardner, Housing Director, Housing and Community Development

DATE: January 13, 2020

SUBJECT: Measure A1 Rental Housing South and East County Regional Pool RFPs and the Unincorporated County ‘Base City’ RFP - Funding Recommendations

Background:

This memorandum presents staff’s recommendations for the award of Measure A1 funds for affordable housing project applications submitted in response to the County’s Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for the East County Regional Pool, South County Regional Pool, and Unincorporated County ‘Base City’ Allocation, released September 2019.

On September 24, 2018, your Committee approved the minimum required thresholds and evaluation criteria for the Regional Pool RFPs. The first Regional Pool RFP was released in Fall, 2018. No proposals were received for the South or East County Regional Pools in response to the RFP. The same Committee-approved thresholds and criteria were included in the Fall 2019 South and East County Regional Pool RFPs. On September 10, 2019, your Committee approved the minimum thresholds and evaluation criteria for the first Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP.

The thresholds and criteria were designed to identify and select the affordable housing projects that were the most financially feasible and “ready to proceed” to construction, in order to be competitive for other financing sources such as the State of California’s Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, No Place Like Home, and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program. The thresholds and criteria were also designed to incentivize the development of units for extremely low-income households and permanent supportive housing units for the homeless.

Of the \$580 million in the Measure A1 Bond, \$425 million is allocated to the Rental Housing Development Fund, of which \$200 million is available through four Regional Pools, and \$225 million is available to each Alameda County locality through established formulas as “Base City Allocations.”

On November 7, 2017, the Board adopted Implementation Policies for the Rental Housing Development Fund. The guiding principles for Measure A1 investment



through the Rental Housing Development Fund are as follows:

- Maximize leverage and produce the largest number of units possible;
- Select feasible projects that can compete well for State/Federal funding;
- Fund projects at a level to ensure viability for the life of the regulatory period; and
- Ensure Bond proceeds fill a gap and do not supplant other funding.

To date, the Board of Supervisors has committed \$245,944,606 from the Measure A1 Rental Housing Development Fund, from both Base City and North and Mid-County Regional Pools, to finance 2,463 affordable units in 35 projects located throughout the County. These funds were matched by more than \$291 million in city funding. Development costs in these projects total more than \$1.64 billion (a leverage ratio of almost 7:1).

Project Review and Selection Process

RFP Release and Application Period – The East and South County Regional Pool RFPs were released on September 3, 2019. The Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP was released on September 10, 2019.

The East and South County Regional Pool RFPs were identical, with the exception of the dollar amount available for funding, containing the same minimum thresholds as well as rating and ranking criteria.

The Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP was the same as the Regional Pool RFPs with a few exceptions. First, the Unincorporated County minimum threshold requirements did not allow the developer to be a local government agency, as the Regional Pool minimum thresholds do, as the projects will be in the unincorporated County and the County will not be the developer. Second, the Unincorporated County minimum match requirement allows the project to demonstrate that the minimum-required match from the County will be committed in advance of construction loan closing, not at the time of the application. With regard to the Rating and Ranking Criteria, the Unincorporated County RFP is the same as the Regional Pool RFP except the Unincorporated County RFP does not have points for “additional match provided beyond minimum requirements”, as there is no city to provide matching funds.

Several bidders’ conferences were held at the public libraries in Castro Valley, Dublin and Fremont, as well as in the Community Development Agency’s Public Hearing Room in Hayward.

Notice of the RFPs and bidders’ conferences were sent out in August 2019 to HCD’s Measure A1, Housing Development and RFP listserves and to businesses on the County Small, Local and Emerging Business (SLEB) list. Sixty-one (61) individuals representing nonprofit and for-profit developers, public agencies, and housing consultants attended the meetings, at which the RFPs and the application formats were presented along with a tutorial on HCD’s on-line application system. Questions asked at the meetings were incorporated into “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ), issued on September 13th. Four subsequent FAQs based on additional questions received via email were released on a weekly basis during the application period to attendees of the bidders’ conferences.

Applications for the East and South County RFPs were due on October 16, 2019. Applications for the Unincorporated County RFP were due on October 22, 2019. HCD received 11 proposals in response to the RFPs, totaling over \$101,896,850 in funding requests. These applications are summarized in the three attachments, one for each RFP.

HCD staff reviewed all application proposals to determine whether the projects met the RFP minimum required thresholds. All 11 proposals passed the threshold requirements and were eligible for funding consideration. Three 3-member County Selection Committees (CSCs) were formed to evaluate the proposals, one for each RFP. Members of the CSCs included County staff and staff from cities outside of the region for which they were reviewing proposals. The CSC members evaluated the proposals and assigned points based on the evaluation criteria published in the RFPs.

Members of the CSC’s independently reviewed and scored the applications, then met to review and discuss project scoring. The scores of the three members of each CSC for each project were averaged, resulting in the final scoring and ranking order. The final rating and ranking order for all projects based on the average final scores for each project is in the tables provided below and in Attachments 1, 2, and 3 summarizing the results from each of the three RFPs.

HCD received three appeals from Eden Housing, Inc. for projects in the East and South County. However, all three appeals were rescinded prior to being reviewed. No appeals were received for projects in the Unincorporated County.

If all recommended projects are funded, 693 total units containing 685 affordable units including 157 units restricted to households earning up to 20% AMI and 205 homeless units, will be added to the county’s stock of affordable housing.

Recommendations

Recommendation: Staff recommends your Committee discuss staff’s funding recommendations and forward the item with recommendation for approval by the full Board of Supervisors at its January 28, 2020 meeting. This schedule will allow developers to include Measure A1 commitment letters for selected projects with their funding applications to other financing sources, such as the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (due February 20) and the first round Competitive Low-Income Housing Tax Credits Program (due March 4).

The tables below list the projects and dollar amounts recommended for funding, along with each project’s score under the RFP ranking criteria and its rank:

East County Regional Pool: Available Project Funding = \$24,599,135			
Project Name	Project Ranking	Average Score	Funding Recommendation
Downtown Livermore Apartments	1	78.00	\$14,402,382
The Vineyard	2	77.33	\$6,197,490
Pacific Avenue Senior Homes	3	75.83	\$3,999,263
Avance	4	67.33	\$0

South County Regional Pool: Available Project Funding = \$ 30,185,486			
Project Name	Project Ranking	Average Score	Funding Recommendation
If Irvington Senior	1	90.00	\$12,200,000
34320 Fremont Blvd. Family Housing	2	89.67	\$6,197,490
Granite Ridge Apartments	3	85.00	\$5,078,933
Lazuli Landing	4	84.67	\$4,453,899
Newark Timber Street Senior	5	73.17	\$0

Unincorporated County Base City Allocation: Available Project Funding = \$17,704,703			
Project Name	Project Ranking	Average Score	Funding Recommendation
Madrone Terrace	1	83.67	\$8,852,351.50
Ruby Street Apartments	2	83.00	\$8,852,351.50

Attachments

Attachment 1 – East County Regional Pool RFP Summary & Recommendations

Attachment 1A— Measure A1 East County Regional Pool RFP Minimum Thresholds and Rating & Ranking Evaluation Criteria

Attachment 1B – Project Summaries

Attachment 2 – South County Regional Pool RFP Summary & Recommendations

Attachment 2A— Measure A1 South County Regional Pool RFP Minimum Thresholds and Rating & Ranking Evaluation Criteria

Attachment 2B – Project Summaries

Attachment 3 – Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP Summary & Recommendations

Attachment 3A— Measure A1 Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP Minimum Thresholds and Rating & Ranking Evaluation Criteria

Attachment 3B – Project Summaries

Attachment 1 – East County Regional Pool Request for Proposals Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The total amount of the East County Regional Pool project funds, \$24,599,135, was released in the Request for Proposals (RFP). Four projects applied for funding, with requests totaling \$36,803,704. All submitted projects are located in the city of Livermore.

All projects met minimum thresholds and were scored by the East County Regional Pool County Selection Committee (CSC). Upon CSC review and scoring, the average of the three CSC member scores was used to place the projects in ranked order.

Project Ranking and Funding Recommendations

Two projects are recommended for full funding, one project is recommended for partial funding in the amount remaining in the Regional Pool after the top two ranked projects were fully funded. One project is not recommended for funding, due to having the lowest score (below the required minimum of 70 points in order to be considered for funding recommendation). The projects, average scores, rank, and amount requested and recommended funding amounts are show below in Table 1:

Table 1: East County Project Rankings and Funding Recommendation

Project Name	Project Ranking	Average Score	Funding Request	Funding Recommendation
Downtown Livermore Apartments	1	78.00	\$14,402,382	\$14,402,382
The Vineyard	2	77.33	\$6,197,490	\$6,197,490
Pacific Avenue Senior Homes	3	75.83	\$15,000,000	\$3,999,263
Avance	4	67.33	\$1,203,832	\$0

As shown in Table 2 below, if funded, the three recommended projects together would add 240 new affordable units to Alameda County’s affordable housing stock, of which 64 will be set aside for households with incomes at or below 20% of the Area Median Income (AMI), and 67 of which will be set aside for permanent supportive housing for the homeless. Project summaries for each project are attached, arranged in order of project ranking.

Table 2: Units in East County Projects Recommended for Funding

Project Name	Total Units	Affordable Units	Units at or below 20% AMI	Homeless Units
Downtown Livermore Apartments	79	78	16	16
Pacific Avenue Senior Homes	140	139	30	28
The Vineyard	23	23	18	23

RFP Goals, Threshold Requirements, and Evaluation Criteria

The RFP thresholds and evaluation criteria were developed primarily to incentivize project readiness, financial feasibility, leveraging of the Measure A1 investment, and targeting of the

Measure A1-funded units to homeless populations through the provision of permanent supportive housing units to the greatest extent possible.

Minimum Thresholds - Projects were assessed first on whether they attained minimum threshold requirements. After staff determined that a project met minimum threshold, it was approved for evaluation based on the rating and ranking Evaluation Criteria. The RFP contained ten threshold requirements: seven from the adopted Implementation Policies for the Measure A1 Rental Housing Development Fund, and three additional thresholds specific to this RFP.

The thresholds from the Implementation Policies included, among others, the requirement that at least twenty percent (20%) of the total project units would be reserved for households with incomes at or below twenty percent (20%) of the Area Median Income (AMI) and that the project serve at least one of the adopted Measure A1 target populations including homeless people, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, re-entry populations, transition-age youth, and lower income workforce. Additional threshold requirements added to this RFP addressed the goals of project feasibility and readiness to proceed. The threshold requirements were designed to ensure that those projects recommended Measure A1 funding will reasonably be able to move into construction within twelve months.

Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria - Attachment 1A contains the RFP minimum thresholds and rating and ranking Evaluation Criteria used in the 2019 East County Regional Pool RFP. A maximum of 124 points were available. Several criteria assessed the project's financial feasibility, readiness to proceed, likelihood of success with outside competitive funding sources, alignment with Measure A1 Implementation Policies, developer experience and capacity, and conformance with HCD's Housing Development Program Policies and Procedures and Administrative Loan Terms. These technical criteria include:

- Readiness to Proceed: 15 points
- Match, Leveraging, and Measure A1 Investment: 15 points
- Financial Feasibility: 21 points
- Developer/Sponsor Experience: 16 points
- **Total Technical Points: 67**

Other categories addressed target populations and project characteristics. These criteria include:

- Neighborhood Access and Amenities: 5 points
- Project Amenities, Accessibility and Green Building: 15 points
- Targeting Units to Homeless or ELI Populations: 18 points
- Resident Services/Supportive Services: 6 points
- Development Partnership: 5 points
- Bonus Points for Additional 20% AMI Units Targeted for Homeless: 8 points
- **Total Points for these Criteria: 57**

Attachment 1A— Measure A1 East County Regional Pool RFP Minimum Thresholds and Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria

Measure A1 Regional Pool Evaluation Criteria

Measure A1 Rental Fund East & South County Regional Pool Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria (September 2019)	Maximum	Scoring Notes
A. Readiness to Proceed	15	
1. Amount of Financing Commitments	5	Points awarded based on a percentage of total committed permanent financing sources, with exception of Measure A1 funding request . All funding sources with exception of A1 must be committed to receive maximum points. Points awarded on a sliding scale for - evidence of enforceable financing commitments other than Measure A1: 5 points if all but A1 are committed; 4 points if 90-99% committed; 3 points if 80-89%; 2 points if 70-79%; 1 point if 60-69%; 0 points if less than 50% committed excluding Measure A1.
2. Environmental Review Approvals	2	Sliding scale based on project's progress towards obtaining Environmental Review Approvals. 2 points if awarded, 1 if under review, and 0 if not yet sought.
3. Entitlements	2	Sliding scale based on project's progress towards obtaining Land Use or Planning Entitlements. 2 points if awarded, 1 if under review, and 0 if not yet sought.
4. Project Ownership Entity	2	2 points if project ownership entity (LLC or LP) has been formed and documentation has been submitted with Application; otherwise, 0 points. For the purposes of this criteria, a W-9, LP Agreement or Articles of Incorporation will be considered acceptable evidence of ownership entity formation.
5. Evaluation of Scope of Development and Project Plan	2	Sliding scale: 2 points for well-defined project that responds comprehensively to required components of the Project Narrative submitted with Application, and scope of development is feasible and meets Measure A1 goals and policies. Otherwise points deducted.
6. Community Outreach Plan is Completed or Underway	2	2 points if Application includes documentation that Community Outreach Plan has been completed or is underway and evidence of such engagement (presentations, flyers, sign-in-sheets, comments received, actions taken) is included with application; 1 points if Community Outreach Plan has been developed but has not begun; 0 points if no plan submitted and no actions taken.
B. Neighborhood Access and Amenities	5	
7. Proximity to services that meet needs of target population(s) of the project (e.g. for family development, proximity to public schools; for senior development, proximity to senior services; for special needs, proximity to services for target population)	2	2 points if project is within 1/2 mile, 1 point if within 1 mile, 0 points if more than 1 mile away. TCAC Regulations have points for types of services needed for type of population. For a general family development, proximity to public schools shall be evaluated. For a Senior Development, proximity to a daily operated senior center or services site for seniors shall be evaluated. For a Special Needs development, proximity to services serving the target population shall be evaluated.
8. Proximity to full-scale grocery store, neighborhood market, and/or farmers' market	1	1 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a full-scale grocery store, 1/2 point if within 1 mile, 0 points if more than 1 mile away. Full-scale grocery stores have at least 25,000 gross interior square feet where staples, fresh meat, and fresh produce are sold. 1/2 point if project is within 1/4 mile of neighborhood market of 5,000 sf where staples, fresh meat, and fresh produce are sold. 1/2 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a weekly farmers' market on list of Certified Farmers' Markets maintained by CA Department of Food & Agriculture and operated at least 5 months per year.
9. Proximity to public transit station	1	1 point if project is within 1/3 mile of public bus stop, light rail station, commuter rail station, ferry terminal, bus station and/or BART station with service at least every 30 minutes during the hours of 7-9am and 4-6pm Monday-Friday. 1/2 point if within 1/2 mile of these public transit facilities, 0 points if more than 1/2 mile away.
10. Proximity to public park, recreation or community center open to the public	1	1 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a public park, recreation center or community center open to the public, 1/2 point if within 3/4 miles, 0 points if more than 3/4 mile away

C. Project Amenities, Accessibility and Green Building	15	
11. Availability of Onsite Amenities	4	0.5 point for every onsite amenity, up to the max of 4 points (Broad-Band Infrastructure Installed throughout, Project, Centralized Laundry, Child Care Center, Community Garden/Planting Beds, Community Kitchen Space, Community Room, Computer Lab, Designated, Support Services Office, Elevator, Outdoor Landscaped Seating Areas, Play Lot/Tot Lot, Property Manager's Office, Resident Services and/or Case Management Offices, or others)
12. Project exceeds minimum accessibility requirements	6	(Sliding Scale: Universal Design = full points; minimum accessibility = 0 points since it is threshold). 2 points if exceeds the minimum number of required accessible units per Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by at least 20%; 3 points if exceeds minimum accessible units by at least 20% <u>plus</u> all remaining units are adaptable; 4 points if exceeds min. accessible units by at least 20%, and all remaining units adaptable <u>plus</u> 100% of project units being Visitable; 6 points if project exceeds Section 504 accessibility by 20%, remaining adaptable units, and project uses Universal Design principles.
13. Project Level of Energy Efficiency/Green Building	5	For Rehab Projects: GPR of 80+ points receives 5 points; GPR score 65-79 gets 3 points; less than GPR score of 65 gets no points. For New construction projects: GPR 140+ (Platinum) or LEED Platinum receives 5 points; GPR 110-139 (Gold) gets 4 points; GPR 80-109 (Silver) or LEED Silver gets 2 points, less than these standards gets no points. Hybrid Rehab/New Construction Projects will receive a weighted score dependent on the number of units associated with each type of development.
D. Targeting Units to Homeless or ELI Populations	18	
14. 20% AMI Units will serve Homeless Populations	6	Project units that are designated for households at 20% or less of AMI (20% of total units must be at 20% AMI per minimum required threshold) will ALL serve homeless populations. Units must be designated for homeless populations, be rented at 20% AMI rent levels, and have a commitment of operating subsidy. 6 points if yes to all conditions; 3 points if units are designated for homeless populations and will be rented at 20% AMI rent levels, but do not yet have a commitment of operating subsidy; otherwise 0 points.
15. Referrals from County Coordinated Entry System to Reach the Homeless with the Highest Barriers to Housing	5	Project will accept referrals for the units designated for homeless populations through the County's Coordinated Entry System, and application includes written commitment of such intention from the executive director of the developer organization. 5 points if yes; otherwise 0 points.
16. Commitment to WIC Section 8255(b) "Housing First" Tenant Screening and Selection Practices	3	Project agrees to implement "Housing First" tenant screening and selection practices as codified in Section 8255(b) of Chapter 6.5 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code. Written commitment must come from the executive director of the developer organization. 3 points if yes; otherwise 0 points. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WIC&division=8.&title=&part=&chapter=6.5.&article=
17. Project has set aside more than the minimum required 20% of total units at 20% AMI for Extremely Low-Income (ELI) Households (households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI), and these households pay no more than 30% of income for rent. Project must meet feasibility test to gain these points	4	1 point for each additional 5% of project units (beyond 20% requirement) provided at 30% or less of AMI up to the maximum 4 points (i.e. projects that provide 40% of total project units for households at or below 30% AMI get full points).

E. Resident Services/Supportive Services	6	
18. Is the Services Plan well-defined and appropriate for the targeted population?	2	Applicant has submitted with application either a written Resident Services Plan and/or a Supportive Services Plan for Special Needs Populations, as applicable. The plan(s) has an identified service provider(s) and scope of services. Scope of services is appropriate for the target populations, FTEs are indicated, plan describes services coordination and case management to be provided, and includes designated services coordinator work space and private space for counseling as required at the project site. Plan discusses whether services are on-site versus referrals to other agencies, and types of services (e.g. children/youth services, tutoring, computer training, other programs; physical and mental health services; education, financial literacy, employment, etc. 2 points, yes; 0 points if no.
19. Is the supportive services budget fully defined, and are there funds identified to pay for it?	2	2 points, yes; 0 points for gaps. The Operating budget must include cost of supportive services. Provide description of what services are provided and the budget for the services. Note if external services are provided at the expense of the external organization.
20. If applicable, are there commitment letters from service providers or MOUs with service providers?	2	If using external organizations and have documentation, 2 points. If providing in-house services, 2 points (no commitment letters/MOUs necessary). If using external orgs and no documentation, 0 points.
F. Match, Leveraging, and Measure A1 Investment	15	
21. Additional Match Provided beyond Minimum Requirements	5	Sliding Scale based on degree to which match exceeds minimum amount required per the Measure A1 Implementation Policies. Ratio of total confirmed proposed match to minimum required amount. If ratio ≥ 30 , then full 5 points given (i.e. proposed match is 30x minimum required); if ratio is 25-29, 4 points; if ratio is 20-24, 3 points; if ratio is 15-19, 2 points; if ratio is 1-14, 1 point.
22. Leveraging of Measure A1 Funding Based on Permanent Commitments	5	Degree to which enforceable permanent financing commitments have been received to leverage Measure A1 funds. Based on amount of enforceable permanent financing commitments from sources other than Measure A1 as percentage of requested amount of Measure A1, as follows: 0 points for less than 25%; 1 point: 25-49%; 2 points: 50-99%; 3 points 100% to 149%; 4 points 150% to 199%; 5 points: $>200\%$.
23. Amount of Measure A1 Investment Per Project - Based on Permanent Financing Need	5	Ratio of total proposed Measure A1 funds as a percentage of total project costs (TPC) based on permanent financing need. 0 points if Applicant is seeking maximum A1 funds per Policies. For 9% TCAC projects, 1 point if A1 is $>25\%$ but less than 30% of TPC; 2 points if A1 is $>20\%$ but less than 25%; 3 points if A1 is $>15\%$ but less than 20% of TPC; 4 points if A1 is $>10\%$ but less than 15% of TPC; 5 points is A1 is less than 10% of TPC. For 4% TCAC projects, 1 point if A1 is $>30\%$ but less than 40% of TPC; 2 points if A1 is $>20\%$ but less than 30% TPC; 3 points if A1 is $>10\%$ but less than 20% TPC; 4 points if A1 is $>5\%$ but less than 10% TPC; 5 points if A1 is less than 5% TPC. For project not seeking tax credits, will use 9% TCAC scale.
G. Financial Feasibility	21	
24. Feasibility of Financing Plan	2	Financing Plan submitted with Application demonstrates that project has a strong likelihood of receiving proposed funding sources. See RFP and Application for further instructions on required components of Financing Plan. Sliding scale: 2 points if Financing Plan is feasible and there is strong likelihood of project receiving proposed funding sources, and financing meets Measure A1 goals and policies. Otherwise, deduct points accordingly.
25. Reasonable Development Costs Analysis	5	subcategories below
26. Project hard costs are no more than 15% different from average of comparable projects (land & soft costs excluded). If a rehab, PNA justifies costs.	4	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Considers both hard cost per unit and hard cost per square foot, if within 15% in either category project will be awarded full points. notes also state that below 15% should not be penalized
27. Required contingency standards are met (10% for new construction; 15% for rehabilitation)	0	Required
28. Relocation budget is appropriate amount for project (if required)	1	Full points if yes (or not required), 0 points if no. Budget should be based on an independent, recently completed Relocation Plan
29. The proforma demonstrates the project's ability to meet its obligations, make payments, and maintain project over time	8	subcategories below
30. Cash flow budget includes \$300/unit/year monitoring fee	1	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Only refers to HCD-restricted units. The number of these units should be based on that indicated in the Proforma and referred to throughout the application.
31. Replacement reserves meet County's standard	1	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Refer to County's Policies and Procedures for comparison.
32. Operating reserves meet County's standard	2	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Refer to County's Policies and Procedures for comparison.
33. Is cash flow positive over 15 year period	4	Full points, if yes; if not, 0 points. Cash flow can be maintained by withdrawing from operating reserves
34. Reasonable & Feasible Operating	6	subcategories below

Budget, measured on a per unit/per year basis; committed sources of rental subsidy required for points if it is proposed in the proforma		
35. Operating costs(not including direct services) vary by no more than 15% from the average of similar projects in this RFP round	3	Full points if yes, 0 points if no.
36. If operating subsidy is needed, is it committed?	3	Full points if yes, 0 points if not committed. If it doesn't need rental subsidy, then it gets full points.
H. Developer/Sponsor Experience	16	
37. Completing more than 3 similar projects or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects on time and within budget	3	3 points if all projects listed completed construction within past 10 years; 2 points if some projects listed completed construction within past 10 years; 1 point if all projects listed completed construction more than 10 years ago.
38. Lead Staff (Project Manager) Experience	2	2 points if PM has completed at least 2 similar projects or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points, 1/2 points if they completed 1 project, 0 points if they have not completed any projects
39. Lead Staff (Project Manager) Capacity	1	Working on up to 3 projects (including one in the application) or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points, more than 3 projects, 0 points.
40. Strength of Development Team (Architect, GC, Legal, Financial Consultant)	3	Other team members (architect, general contractor, legal, financial consultant) have worked on at least 3 similar projects(including one in the application) or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points. If other team members have worked on 2 similar projects, deduct 0.5 point; 1 similar project, deduct 1 point
41. Management Company Experience	1	1 point if management company has 11 or more projects managed over 3 years; 1/2 point if 6-10 projects managed over 3 years
42. Experience meeting Local/Targeted Hiring Goals	1	The applicant submits evidence of meeting local/targeted hiring goals in at least 3 previous affordable housing developments completed in the past 10 years. 1 point if yes, 0 points if no.
43. Developer has local government reference letter for past performance, including monitoring performance.	5	The applicant submits written letter of reference/recommendation from housing director or equivalent level from jurisdiction other than jurisdiction in which proposed Measure A1 project located. 5 points if letter provides positive recommendation on developer's ability to deliver affordable housing project on-time and on-budget and have no unresolved findings and/or issues with respect to monitoring performance. Deduct points accordingly.
I. Development Partnership	5	
44. Developer has partnered with a Community-Based or Faith-Based Organization with land asset for project	5	The developer is partnering with a community-based or faith-based organization (CBO or FBO) bringing land asset to the proposed development. 5 points if yes; 0 points if no. Application must include written documentation of partnership through MOU or other equivalent executed agreement between developer and CBO/FBO.
J. Total Points	116	
45. BONUS POINTS FOR ADDITIONAL 20% AMI UNITS TARGETED FOR HOMELESS	8	Basic threshold requires projects to include 20% of total units for households at 20% AMI or less. If project will designate additional units for households over and above the 20% of total required <u>which are specifically designated for homeless households, have committed operating subsidies, and have agreed to accept referrals through the County's Coordinated Entry System,</u> bonus points will be awarded. Up to 4 points will be available for projects that set aside up to 40% of their units for homeless (1pt for each 5% of units); AND 4 points will be available on a bell curve for the total number of units set aside (project with most gets all four, project with least gets 1).
K. Total Points Including Bonus Points	124	

Minimum Threshold Requirements

1. The developer must be a nonprofit organization, a local government agency, or a joint venture that includes a qualified nonprofit organization.
2. The proposed project must be located in the East County region of Alameda County.
3. The majority of project units must serve households with incomes between 30% and 60% AMI for Alameda County, as published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
4. At least twenty percent (20%) of the project units must be reserved for extremely low-income households with incomes of no more than 20% AMI.
5. The project must be new construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, rehabilitation of existing affordable housing with extended affordability.
6. Project must provide permanent affordable rental housing.
7. The applicant must have site control.
8. Project will serve at least one of the priority target population groups identified in the Implementation Policies, including the following: homeless people, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, re-entry populations, transition-age youth aging out of foster care, and/or lower-income workforce.
9. Requested funds must fill a financing gap. The project must not already be fully funded with permanent financing, and Measure A1 may not replace other permanent funding on the project.
10. Project must demonstrate in the Application that the minimum required match contribution from Alameda County will be committed in advance of construction loan closing, and is administratively approved prior to submittal of the Application, and include documentation of such. The minimum amount of match must equal the County's planning and building fees, not including impact fees, for the jurisdiction in which the project is located. Eligible match types are described in Section VI of the Implementation Policies.

Attachment 1B – Project Summaries

PROJECT NAME		Downtown Livermore Apartments			
Average Score		78.00			
Project Address		Railroad & L Street			
Project Developer		Eden Housing, Inc. (Eden)			
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization		No			
Type of Project		New construction			
Total Project Units and Sizes		79 total; 78 affordable; 1 resident manager’s unit 17 one-bedroom units 42 two-bedroom units (including resident manager’s unit) 20 three-bedroom units			
General Income Levels Served		100% affordable to households earning at or below 50% Area Median Income (AMI)			
Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County’s Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First					
% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
16 units (20% of total units)	16 units (20% of total units)	78 lower-income work force	16 units (20% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	78 (99% of total units) 16 at 20% AMI 62 at 50% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$14,402,382– Regional Pool 24% of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 5,240,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$301,273 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Livermore has provided a preliminary commitment of \$500,000 in funding to the project, as well as a land donation valued at \$4.7 million.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA review has been completed and the existing CEQA review undertaken by the city was found to be still valid for this project. Staff determined that NEPA review was not needed.
Project Accessibility	Eight (8) units are accessible: five (5) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and three (3) units with auditory/visual disabilities. All units will be adaptable and “visitable”. All units will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by 20%.
Project Green Building Features	Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 110.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community kitchen space, community room, computer lab, elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager’s office, resident services and/or case management offices. The project is located

	within .04 miles of the Livermore Farmers Market and 0.4 miles from Safeway. The closest schools are Livermore High School, located 0.6 miles away and St Michael Elementary School, located 0.4 miles away. The Lizzie Fountain Park is located 0.2 miles away and the Livermore Transit Center is located 0.3 miles away.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will coordinate services through Eden Housing Resident Services Inc. (EHRSI). Services provided will include English as a Second Language courses, financial education, job skills training, health and wellness classes, green education youth programming, and art classes. Additionally, referrals to other service programs will be provided.
Developer Capacity/Experience	Eden is a Tier 1 developer. Since its founding in 1968, Eden has developed, acquired or rehabilitated more than 10,600 affordable units, and currently provides homes to more than 22,000 lower-income residents. Incomes of residents typically range from 20% to 60% of AMI

PROJECT NAME		The Vineyard			
Average Score		77.33			
Project Address		460 N. Livermore Avenue			
Project Developer		Housing Consortium of the East Bay (HCEB)			
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization		No			
Type of Project		New construction			
Total Project Units and Sizes		23 total; 23 affordable 18 studios 5 one-bedroom units			
General Income Levels Served		100 % affordable to households earning at or below 30% Area Median Income (AMI).			
Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First					
% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
18 units (78% of total units)	23 units (100% of total units)	23 units for chronically homeless households	23 units (100% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for Homeless Units;	23 units (100% of total units) 11 at 15% AMI 7 at 20% AMI 5 at 30% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$6,197,490– Regional Pool 25.6% of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 3,125,110 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$119,920 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Livermore has provided a predevelopment loan of \$855,100 and a permanent acquisition loan of \$2,270,000.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	The developer has submitted an environmental review to the City of Livermore.
Project Accessibility	Seven (7) units are accessible: three (3) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and four (4) units will be for residents with auditory/visual disabilities. All units will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements.
Project Green Building Features	Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 122.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: broad-band infrastructure, centralized laundry, community kitchen space, community room, computer lab, designated support services office, outdoor landscaped seating areas, Resident servicers and/or case management offices. The project is located 1.2 miles from Safeway. The closest park is Civic Center Park located 0.2 miles away. There is a bus stop located 0.06 miles away at Pacific & Dolores.

Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	The Developer has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Bay Area Community Services (BACS), Trivalley BMR LLC, and Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (BCHS). Services will focus on assisting individuals to identify and prevent actions or circumstances that resulted in them previously losing housing.
Developer Capacity/Experience	HCEB is a Tier 1 developer. HCEB has developed affordable, supportive housing for 13 years, and has participated in the development of over 40 properties in 15 cities throughout the East Bay.

PROJECT NAME	Pacific Avenue Senior Homes
Average Score	75.83
Project Address	3701 Pacific Ave Livermore, CA 94550
Project Developer	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	Yes
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	140 total; 139 affordable; 1 resident manager's unit 124 one-bedroom units 16 two-bedroom units (including resident manager's unit)
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households earning at or below 60% Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
30 units (21% of total units)	44 units (31% of total units)	139 units for Seniors, of these 28 units will be chronically homeless, 35 for veterans and 17 with mental disabilities	28 units for chronically homeless (20% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for Homeless Units;	73 (52% of total units) 28 at 20% AMI 14 at 30% AMI 31 at 50% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$15,000,000– Regional Pool 20 % of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$8,400,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$806,000 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Livermore has provided a commitment of a land donation that has not been officially appraised yet, however estimates place its value at \$8.4 million.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	A Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted in December 2019.
Project Accessibility	Twenty (20) units are accessible: fourteen (14) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and six (6) units with auditory/visual disabilities.; All units will be adaptable and “visitable” units and all will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by over 20%.
Project Green Building Features	Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 121.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community garden, community kitchen space, community room, computer lab,

	<p>elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager's office, resident services and/or case management offices. Livermore Farmers' Market is within 0.9 miles, and Safeway is located 1.4 miles away. Civic Center Park is located 0.1 miles away. There is an AC transit bus stop located 0.2 miles from the project.</p>
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	<p>SAHA will provide onsite services through a SAHA Resident Services Coordinator (RSC). Services will include referral support, assessment and service plan development, tenant leadership development, lease counseling, accessing primary and behavioral health services, employment skills, benefit navigation, food assistance and other services to remove barriers to housing retention.</p>
Developer Capacity/Experience	<p>SAHA is a Tier 1 developer. SAHA maintains over 3,000 units serving seniors, families, veterans, transition aged youth, homeless, and those with physical, mental and developmental disabilities.</p>

PROJECT NAME	Avance
Average Score	67.33
Project Address	4260 First Street, Livermore
Project Developer	MidPen Housing
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	45 total; 44 affordable; 1 resident manager's unit 12 studios 32 one-bedroom units 1 three-bedroom unit (including resident manager's unit)
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households earning at or below 50% Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
13 units (29% of total units)	22 units (49% of total units)	44 units for people with developmental disabilities	No units are targeted towards the homeless	Has not committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	44 (98% of total units) 13 at 20% AMI 19 at 30% AMI 8 at 40% AMI 4 at 50% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$1,203,853– Regional Pool; \$4,743,935—Base City; 22% of Total Development Cost (total Base and Regional Pool)
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 4,300,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$229,860 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Livermore has provided a commitment of \$4.3 million in city funding to the project.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA and NEPA environmental reviews were completed by HUD on 07/15/17. These findings concluded that there are Findings of No Significant Impact.
Project Accessibility	Seven (7) units are accessible: five (5) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and two (2) units with auditory/visual disabilities. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by 20%.
Project Green Building Features	LEED scorecard indicates anticipated point score of 41 points.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: broad-band infrastructure, centralized laundry, community garden, community kitchen space, community room, designated support services office, outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager's office, resident services and/or

	case management offices. Project is located 0.8 miles from Jackson Avenue Elementary School. The nearest grocery store is Safeway, located 0.2 miles away. Wattenburger Park is located 0.9 miles from the project. There is an AC transit bus stop located 0.1 miles from the project.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will provide services through MidPen Service Coordinator. Services will include assistance in accessing multiple outside services including paratransit, and educational or employment activities, computer classes, cooking classes, money skills classes, and health related classes.
Developer Capacity/Experience	MidPen is a Tier 1 developer. In its 50 year history, MidPen has developed or rehabilitated over 8,000 affordable homes across 11 counties. MidPen has completed more than 3 similar projects all of which were completed on time and within budget.

Attachment 2 – South County Regional Pool Request for Proposals Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The total amount of the South County Regional Pool project funds, \$30,185,486, was released in the Request for Proposals (RFP). Five projects applied for funding with requests totaling \$38,486,219. Three projects are in the City of Fremont, one in the City of Newark, and one in the City of Union City.

All projects met minimum thresholds and were scored by the South County Regional Pool County Selection Committee (CSC). Upon CSC review and scoring, the average of the three CSC member scores was used to place the projects in ranked order.

Project Ranking and Funding Recommendations

Three projects are recommended for full funding, one project is recommended for partial funding in the amount remaining in the Regional Pool after the top three ranked projects were fully funded. One project is not recommended for funding, due to having the lowest score. The projects, average scores, rank, and amount requested and recommended funding amounts are show below in Table 1:

Table 1: South County Project Rankings and Funding Recommendations

Project Name	Project Ranking	Average Score	Funding Request	Funding Recommendation
Irvington Senior	1	90.00	\$12,200,000	\$12,200,000
34320 Fremont Blvd. Family Housing	2	89.67	\$8,452,654	\$8,452,654
Granite Ridge Apartments	3	85.00	\$5,078,933	\$5,078,933
Lazuli Landing	4	84.67	\$6,000,630	\$4,453,899
Newark Timber Street Senior	5	73.17	\$6,754,002	\$0

As shown in Table 2 below, if funded, the four recommended projects together would add 294 new affordable units to Alameda County’s affordable housing stock, of which 62 will be set aside for households with incomes at or below 20% of the Area Median Income (AMI), and 62 of which will be set aside for permanent supportive housing for the homeless. Project summaries for each project are attached, arranged in order of project ranking.

Table 2: Units in South County Projects Recommended for Funding

Project Name	Total Units	Affordable Units	Units at or below 20% AMI	Homeless Units
Irvington Senior	90	89	18	18
34320 Fremont Blvd. Family Housing	54	53	13	13
Granite Ridge Apartments	73	72	15	15
Lazuli Landing	81	80	16	16

RFP Goals, Threshold Requirements, and Evaluation Criteria

The RFP thresholds and evaluation criteria were developed primarily to incentivize project readiness, financial feasibility, leveraging of the Measure A1 investment, and targeting of the Measure-A1 funded units to homeless populations through the provision of permanent supportive housing units to the greatest extent possible.

Minimum Thresholds - Projects were assessed first on whether they attained minimum threshold requirements. After staff determined that a project met minimum threshold, it was approved for evaluation on the basis of the rating and ranking Evaluation Criteria. The RFP contained ten threshold requirements: seven from the adopted Implementation Policies for the Measure A1 Rental Housing Development Fund, and three additional thresholds specific to this RFP.

The thresholds from the Implementation Policies included, among others, the requirement that at least twenty percent (20%) of the total project units would be reserved for households with incomes at or below twenty percent (20%) of the Area Median Income (AMI) and that the project serve at least one of the adopted Measure A1 target populations including homeless people, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, re-entry populations, transition-age youth, and lower income workforce. Additional threshold requirements added to this RFP addressed the goals of project feasibility and readiness to proceed. The threshold requirements were designed to ensure that those projects recommended Measure A1 funding will reasonably be able to move into construction within twelve months.

Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria - **Attachment 2A** contains the RFP minimum thresholds and rating and ranking Evaluation Criteria used in the 2019 South County Regional Pool RFP. A maximum of 124 points were available. Several criteria assessed the project's financial feasibility, readiness to proceed, likelihood of success with outside competitive funding sources, alignment with Measure A1 Implementation Policies, developer experience and capacity, and conformance with HCD's Housing Development Program Policies and Procedures and Administrative Loan Terms. These technical criteria include:

- Readiness to Proceed: 15 points
- Match, Leveraging, and Measure A1 Investment: 15 points
- Financial Feasibility: 21 points
- Developer/Sponsor Experience: 16 points
- **Total Technical Points: 67**

Other categories addressed target populations and project characteristics. These criteria include:

- Neighborhood Access and Amenities: 5 points
- Project Amenities, Accessibility and Green Building: 15 points
- Targeting Units to Homeless or ELI Populations: 18 points
- Resident Services/Supportive Services: 6 points
- Development Partnership: 5 points
- Bonus Points for Additional 20% AMI Units Targeted for Homeless: 8 points
- **Total Points for these Criteria: 57**

**Attachment 2A— Measure A1 South County Regional Pool
 RFP Minimum Thresholds and Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria**

Measure A1 Regional Pool Evaluation Criteria

Measure A1 Rental Fund East & South County Regional Pool Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria (September 2019)	Maximum	Scoring Notes
A. Readiness to Proceed	15	
1. Amount of Financing Commitments	5	Points awarded based on a percentage of total committed permanent financing sources, with exception of Measure A1 funding request . All funding sources with exception of A1 must be committed to receive maximum points. Points awarded on a sliding scale for - evidence of enforceable financing commitments other than Measure A1: 5 points if all but A1 are committed; 4 points if 90-99% committed; 3 points if 80-89%; 2 points if 70-79%; 5 points if 60-69%; 1 point if 50-59%; 0 points if less than 50% committed excluding Measure A1.
2. Environmental Review Approvals	2	Sliding scale based on project's progress towards obtaining Environmental Review Approvals. 2 points if awarded, 1 if under review, and 0 if not yet sought.
3. Entitlements	2	Sliding scale based on project's progress towards obtaining Land Use or Planning Entitlements. 2 points if awarded, 1 if under review, and 0 if not yet sought.
4. Project Ownership Entity	2	2 points if project ownership entity (LLC or LP) has been formed and documentation has been submitted with Application; otherwise, 0 points. For the purposes of this criteria, a W-9, LP Agreement or Articles of Incorporation will be considered acceptable evidence of ownership entity formation.
5. Evaluation of Scope of Development and Project Plan	2	Sliding scale: 2 points for well-defined project that responds comprehensively to required components of the Project Narrative submitted with Application, and scope of development is feasible and meets Measure A1 goals and policies. Otherwise points deducted.
6. Community Outreach Plan is Completed or Underway	2	2 points if Application includes documentation that Community Outreach Plan has been completed or is underway and evidence of such engagement (presentations, flyers, sign-in-sheets, comments received, actions taken) is included with application; 1 points if Community Outreach Plan has been developed but has not begun; 0 points if no plan submitted and no actions taken.
B. Neighborhood Access and Amenities	5	
7. Proximity to services that meet needs of target population(s) of the project (e.g. for family development, proximity to public schools; for senior development, proximity to senior services; for special needs, proximity to services for target population)	2	2 points if project is within 1/2 mile, 1 point if within 1 mile, 0 points if more than 1 mile away. TCAC Regulations have points for types of services needed for type of population. For a general family development, proximity to public schools shall be evaluated. For a Senior Development, proximity to a daily operated senior center or services site for seniors shall be evaluated. For a Special Needs development, proximity to services serving the target population shall be evaluated.
8. Proximity to full-scale grocery store, neighborhood market, and/or farmers' market	1	1 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a full-scale grocery store, 1/2 point if within 1 mile, 0 points if more than 1 mile away. Full-scale grocery stores have at least 25,000 gross interior square feet where staples, fresh meat, and fresh produce are sold. 1/2 point if project is within 1/4 mile of neighborhood market of 5,000 sf where staples, fresh meat, and fresh produce are sold. 1/2 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a weekly farmers' market on list of Certified Farmers' Markets maintained by CA Department of Food & Agriculture and operated at least 5 months per year.
9. Proximity to public transit station	1	1 point if project is within 1/3 mile of public bus stop, light rail station, commuter rail station, ferry terminal, bus station and/or BART station with service at least every 30 minutes during the hours of 7-9am and 4-6pm Monday-Friday. 1/2 point if within 1/2 mile of these public transit facilities, 0 points if more than 1/2 mile away.
10. Proximity to public park, recreation or community center open to the public	1	1 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a public park, recreation center or community center open to the public, 1/2 point if within 3/4 miles, 0 points if more than 3/4 mile away

C. Project Amenities, Accessibility and Green Building	15	
11. Availability of Onsite Amenities	4	0.5 point for every onsite amenity, up to the max of 4 points (Broad-Band Infrastructure Installed throughout, Project, Centralized Laundry, Child Care Center, Community Garden/Planting Beds, Community Kitchen Space, Community Room, Computer Lab, Designated, Support Services Office, Elevator, Outdoor Landscaped Seating Areas, Play Lot/Tot Lot, Property Manager's Office, Resident Services and/or Case Management Offices, or others)
12. Project exceeds minimum accessibility requirements	6	(Sliding Scale: Universal Design = full points; minimum accessibility = 0 points since it is threshold). 2 points if exceeds the minimum number of required accessible units per Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by at least 20%; 3 points if exceeds minimum accessible units by at least 20% plus all remaining units are adaptable; 4 points if exceeds min. accessible units by at least 20%, and all remaining units adaptable plus 100% of project units being Visitable; 6 points if project exceeds Section 504 accessibility by 20%, remaining adaptable units, and project uses Universal Design principles.
13. Project Level of Energy Efficiency/Green Building	5	For Rehab Projects: GPR of 80+ points receives 5 points; GPR score 65-79 gets 3 points; less than GPR score of 65 gets no points. For New construction projects: GPR 140+ (Platinum) or LEED Platinum receives 5 points; GPR 110-139 (Gold) gets 4 points; GPR 80-109 (Silver) or LEED Silver gets 2 points, less than these standards gets no points. Hybrid Rehab/New Construction Projects will receive a weighted score dependent on the number of units associated with each type of development.
D. Targeting Units to Homeless or ELI Populations	18	
14. 20% AMI Units will serve Homeless Populations	6	Project units that are designated for households at 20% or less of AMI (20% of total units must be at 20% AMI per minimum required threshold) will ALL serve homeless populations. Units must be designated for homeless populations, be rented at 20% AMI rent levels, and have a commitment of operating subsidy. 6 points if yes to all conditions; 3 points if units are designated for homeless populations and will be rented at 20% AMI rent levels, but do not yet have a commitment of operating subsidy; otherwise 0 points.
15. Referrals from County Coordinated Entry System to Reach the Homeless with the Highest Barriers to Housing	5	Project will accept referrals for the units designated for homeless populations through the County's Coordinated Entry System, and application includes written commitment of such intention from the executive director of the developer organization. 5 points if yes; otherwise 0 points.
16. Commitment to WIC Section 8255(b) "Housing First" Tenant Screening and Selection Practices	3	Project agrees to implement "Housing First" tenant screening and selection practices as codified in Section 8255(b) of Chapter 6.5 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code. Written commitment must come from the executive director of the developer organization. 3 points if yes; otherwise 0 points. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WIC&division=8.&title=&part=&chapter=6.5.&article=
17. Project has set aside more than the minimum required 20% of total units at 20% AMI for Extremely Low-Income (ELI) Households (households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI), and these households pay no more than 30% of income for rent. Project must meet feasibility test to gain these points	4	1 point for each additional 5% of project units (beyond 20% requirement) provided at 30% or less of AMI up to the maximum 4 points (i.e. projects that provide 40% of total project units for households at or below 30% AMI get full points).

E. Resident Services/Supportive Services	6	
18. Is the Services Plan well-defined and appropriate for the targeted population?	2	Applicant has submitted with application either a written Resident Services Plan and/or a Supportive Services Plan for Special Needs Populations, as applicable. The plan(s) has an identified service provider(s) and scope of services. Scope of services is appropriate for the target populations, FTEs are indicated, plan describes services coordination and case management to be provided, and includes designated services coordinator work space and private space for counseling as required at the project site. Plan discusses whether services are on-site versus referrals to other agencies, and types of services (e.g. children/youth services, tutoring, computer training, other programs; physical and mental health services; education, financial literacy, employment, etc. 2 points, yes; 0 points if no.
19. Is the supportive services budget fully defined, and are there funds identified to pay for it?	2	2 points, yes; 0 points for gaps. The Operating budget must include cost of supportive services. Provide description of what services are provided and the budget for the services. Note if external services are provided at the expense of the external organization.
20. If applicable, are there commitment letters from service providers or MOUs with service providers?	2	If using external organizations and have documentation, 2 points. If providing in-house services, 2 points (no commitment letters/MOUs necessary). If using external orgs and no documentation, 0 points.
F. Match, Leveraging, and Measure A1 Investment	15	
21. Additional Match Provided beyond Minimum Requirements	5	Sliding Scale based on degree to which match exceeds minimum amount required per the Measure A1 Implementation Policies. Ratio of total confirmed proposed match to minimum required amount. If ratio =>30, then full 5 points given (i.e. proposed match is 30x minimum required); if ratio is 25-29, 4 points; if ratio is 20-24, 3 points; if ratio is 15-19, 2 points; if ratio is 1-14, 1 point.
22. Leveraging of Measure A1 Funding Based on Permanent Commitments	5	Degree to which enforceable permanent financing commitments have been received to leverage Measure A1 funds. Based on amount of enforceable permanent financing commitments from sources other than Measure A1 as percentage of requested amount of Measure A1, as follows: 0 points for less than 25%; 1 point: 25-49%; 2 points: 50-99%; 3 points 100% to 149%; 4 points 150% to 199%; 5 points: >200%.
23. Amount of Measure A1 Investment Per Project - Based on Permanent Financing Need	5	Ratio of total proposed Measure A1 funds as a percentage of total project costs (TPC) based on permanent financing need. 0 points if Applicant is seeking maximum A1 funds per Policies. For 9% TCAC projects, 1 point if A1 is >25% but less than 30% of TPC; 2 points if A1 is >20% but less than 25%; 3 points if A1 is >15% but less than 20% of TPC; 4 points if A1 is >10% but less than 15% of TPC; 5 points is A1 is less than 10% of TPC. For 4% TCAC projects, 1 point if A1 is >30% but less than 40% of TPC; 2 points if A1 is >20% but less than 30% TPC; 3 points if A1 is >10% but less than 20% TPC; 4 points if A1 is >5% but less than 10% TPC; 5 points if A1 is less than 5% TPC. For project not seeking tax credits, will use 9% TCAC scale.
G. Financial Feasibility	21	
24. Feasibility of Financing Plan	2	Financing Plan submitted with Application demonstrates that project has a strong likelihood of receiving proposed funding sources. See RFP and Application for further instructions on required components of Financing Plan. Sliding scale: 2 points if Financing Plan is feasible and there is strong likelihood of project receiving proposed funding sources, and financing meets Measure A1 goals and policies. Otherwise, deduct points accordingly.
25. Reasonable Development Costs Analysis	5	subcategories below
<i>26. Project hard costs are no more than 15% different from average of comparable projects (land & soft costs excluded). If a rehab, PNA justifies costs.</i>	4	<i>Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Considers both hard cost per unit and hard cost per square foot, if within 15% in either category project will be awarded full points.</i> notes also state that below 15% should not be penalized
<i>27. Required contingency standards are met (10% for new construction; 15% for rehabilitation)</i>	0	<i>Required</i>
<i>28. Relocation budget is appropriate amount for project (if required)</i>	1	<i>Full points if yes (or not required), 0 points if no. Budget should be based on an independent, recently completed Relocation Plan</i>
29. The proforma demonstrates the project's ability to meet its obligations, make payments, and maintain project over time	8	subcategories below
<i>30. Cash flow budget includes \$300/unit/year monitoring fee</i>	1	<i>Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Only refers to HCD-restricted units. The number of these units should be based on that indicated in the Proforma and referred to throughout the application.</i>
<i>31. Replacement reserves meet County's standard</i>	1	<i>Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Refer to County's Policies and Procedures for comparison.</i>
<i>32. Operating reserves meet County's standard</i>	2	<i>Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Refer to County's Policies and Procedures for comparison.</i>

Alameda County Health Committee
 January 13, 2020
 Page 25

33. Is cash flow positive over 15 year period	4	Full points, if yes; if not, 0 points. Cash flow can be maintained by withdrawing from operating reserves
34. Reasonable & Feasible Operating Budget, measured on a per unit/per year basis; committed sources of rental subsidy required for points if it is proposed in the proforma	6	subcategories below
35. Operating costs(not including direct services) vary by no more than 15% from the average of similar projects in this RFP round	3	Full points if yes, 0 points if no.
36. If operating subsidy is needed, is it committed?	3	Full points if yes, 0 points if not committed. If it doesn't need rental subsidy, then it gets full points.
H. Developer/Sponsor Experience	16	
37. Completing more than 3 similar projects or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects on time and within budget	3	3 points if all projects listed completed construction within past 10 years; 2 points if some projects listed completed construction within past 10 years; 1 point if all projects listed completed construction more than 10 years ago.
38. Lead Staff (Project Manager) Experience	2	2 points if PM has completed at least 2 similar projects or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points, 1/2 points if they completed 1 project, 0 points if they have not completed any projects
39. Lead Staff (Project Manager) Capacity	1	Working on up to 3 projects (including one in the application) or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points, more than 3 projects, 0 points.
40. Strength of Development Team (Architect, GC, Legal, Financial Consultant)	3	Other team members (architect, general contractor, legal, financial consultant) have worked on at least 3 similar projects(including one in the application) or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points. If other team members have worked on 2 similar projects, deduct 0.5 point; 1 similar project, deduct 1 point
41. Management Company Experience	1	1 point if management company has 11 or more projects managed over 3 years; 1/2 point if 6-10 projects managed over 3 years
42. Experience meeting Local/Targeted Hiring Goals	1	The applicant submits evidence of meeting local/targeted hiring goals in at least 3 previous affordable housing developments completed in the past 10 years. 1 point if yes, 0 points if no.
43. Developer has local government reference letter for past performance, including monitoring performance.	5	The applicant submits written letter of reference/recommendation from housing director or equivalent level from jurisdiction other than jurisdiction in which proposed Measure A1 project located. 5 points if letter provides positive recommendation on developer's ability to deliver affordable housing project on-time and on-budget and have no unresolved findings and/or issues with respect to monitoring performance. Deduct points accordingly.
I. Development Partnership	5	
44. Developer has partnered with a Community-Based or Faith-Based Organization with land asset for project	5	The developer is partnering with a community-based or faith-based organization (CBO or FBO) bringing land asset to the proposed development. 5 points if yes; 0 points if no. Application must include written documentation of partnership through MOU or other equivalent executed agreement between developer and CBO/FBO.
J. Total Points	116	
45. BONUS POINTS FOR ADDITIONAL 20% AMI UNITS TARGETED FOR HOMELESS	8	Basic threshold requires projects to include 20% of total units for households at 20% AMI or less. If project will designate additional units for households over and above the 20% of total required <u>which are specifically designated for homeless households, have committed operating subsidies, and have agreed to accept referrals through the County's Coordinated Entry System,</u> bonus points will be awarded. Up to 4 points will be available for projects that set aside up to 40% of their units for homeless (1pt for each 5% of units); AND 4 points will be available on a bell curve for the total number of units set aside (project with most gets all four, project with least gets 1).
K. Total Points Including Bonus Points	124	

Minimum Threshold Requirements

1. The developer must be a nonprofit organization, a local government agency, or a joint venture that includes a qualified nonprofit organization.
2. The proposed project must be located in the South County region of Alameda County.
3. The majority of project units must serve households with incomes between 30% and 60% AMI for Alameda County, as published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
4. At least twenty percent (20%) of the project units must be reserved for extremely low-income households with incomes of no more than 20% AMI.
5. The project must be new construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, rehabilitation of existing affordable housing with extended affordability.
6. Project must provide permanent affordable rental housing.
7. The applicant must have site control.
8. Project will serve at least one of the priority target population groups identified in the Implementation Policies, including the following: homeless people, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, re-entry populations, transition-age youth aging out of foster care, and/or lower-income workforce.
9. Requested funds must fill a financing gap. The project must not already be fully funded with permanent financing, and Measure A1 may not replace other permanent funding on the project.
10. Project must demonstrate in the Application that the minimum required match contribution from Alameda County will be committed in advance of construction loan closing, and is administratively approved prior to submittal of the Application, and include documentation of such. The minimum amount of match must equal the County's planning and building fees, not including impact fees, for the jurisdiction in which the project is located. Eligible match types are described in Section VI of the Implementation Policies.

Attachment 2B – Project Summaries

PROJECT NAME	Irvington Senior
Average Score	90.00
Project Address	4038 Irvington Avenue
Project Developer	Allied Housing, Inc. (Allied)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	90 total; 89 affordable; 1 resident manager’s unit 81 one-bedroom units 9 two-bedroom units (including resident manager’s unit)
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households earning at or below 50% Area Median Income (AMI)

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County’s Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
18 units (20% of total units)	45 units (50% of total units)	89 units for seniors, 44 units for people with mental disabilities, 23 units for chronically homeless	18 units (20% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	89 (98% of total units) 18 at 20% AMI 27 at 30% AMI 19 at 40% AMI 25 at 50% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$12,200,000– Regional Pool 18.49% of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 9,000,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$750,000 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Fremont has provided a preliminary commitment of \$9 million in funding to the project.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA review has been completed and the project was found to be exempt from CEQA review. Staff determined that NEPA review was not needed.
Project Accessibility	Forty-nine (49) units are accessible: forty-five (45) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and four (4) units with auditory/visual disabilities. All units will be adaptable

	and “visitable”. All units will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by over 20%.
Project Green Building Features	Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 123.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community garden, community kitchen space, community room, computer lab, designated support services office, elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager’s office, resident services and/or case management offices. The project is within 0.2 miles of several groceries including Safeway. The closest park is located 0.1 miles away. There is a bus stop located 0.02 miles away.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will partner with Abode Services as the primary resident services provider. Abode will provide a Case Manager and Service Coordinator; these staff will provide individual self-sufficiency plans and identify services and resources to address the needs of the residents.
Developer Capacity/Experience	Allied is a Tier 1 developer. It has developed, rehabilitated, or preserved 375 units of affordable housing since 2005. They currently have over 600 units in the pipeline as lead developer and over 350 units as a joint venture partner throughout Alameda, Santa Clara and Napa Counties.

PROJECT NAME	34320 Fremont Blvd Family Housing
Average Score	89.67
Project Address	34320 Fremont Blvd
Project Developer	Allied Housing, Inc. (Allied)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	Yes
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	54 total; 53 affordable; 1 resident manager's unit 22 one-bedroom units 17 two-bedroom units (including resident manager's unit) 15 three-bedroom units
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households earning at or below 60% Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
13 units (24% of total units)	27 units (50% of total units)	27 homeless transition-aged youth; 54 lower-income workforce	13 units (24% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for Homeless Units	53 (98% of total units) 13 at 20% AMI 14 at 30% AMI 6 at 40% AMI 10 at 50% AMI 10 at 60% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$8,452,654– Regional Pool; 20.46% of total development cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 5,400,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$290,400 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Fremont has provided a preliminary commitment of \$5.4 million in funding to the project.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA review has been completed and the project was found to be exempt from CEQA review. Staff determined that NEPA review was not needed.
Project Accessibility	Nine (9) units are accessible: six (6) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and three (3) units with

	<p>auditory/visual disabilities. All units will be adaptable and “visitable”. All units will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by 20%.</p>
Project Green Building Features	<p>Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 116.</p>
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	<p>Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community room, designated support services office, elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, play lot, property manager’s office, resident services and/or case management offices. Project is located 0.5 miles from Warwick Elementary School and 0.7 miles from Ardenwood Elementary School. 99 Ranch Market and Lucky grocery stores are both located within 0.2 miles. North Gate Community park is located 0.2 miles from the project. There is an AC transit bus stop located 0.06 miles from the project.</p>
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	<p>Developer will partner with Abode Services as the primary resident services provider. Abode will provide a Case Manager and Service Coordinator who will provide individual self-sufficiency plans and identify services and resources to address the needs of the residents. These services will include vocational assistance, health and dental referrals, substance abuse treatment, mediation, mental health services, family support, and others.</p>
Developer Capacity/Experience	<p>Allied is a Tier 1 developer. It has developed, rehabilitated, or preserved 375 units of affordable housing since 2005. Allied currently has more than 600 units in the pipeline as lead developer and over 350 units as a joint venture partner throughout Alameda, Santa Clara and Napa Counties.</p>

PROJECT NAME	Granite Ridge Apartments
Average Score	85.00
Project Address	7350 Sequoia Road
Project Developer	Eden Housing, Inc. (Eden)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	73 total; 72 affordable; 1 resident manager's unit, 32 one-bedroom units 22 two-bedroom units (including resident manager's unit) 19 three-bedroom units
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households earning at or below 60% Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, targeting to Extremely Low Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
15 units (20% of total units)	15 units (20% of total units)	72 units for lower income families; 15 units for homeless families	15 units (20% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for Homeless Units;	50 units (68% of total units) 15 at 20% AMI 15 at 40% AMI 10 at 50% AMI 10 at 60% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$5,078,933– Regional Pool, \$4,621,067 Base City 21% of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 7,500,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$456,956 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Fremont has provided a \$7.5 million loan from the city's Affordable Housing Funds.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA review has been completed as of 2015. NEPA review has not been completed.
Project Accessibility	Eight (8) units are accessible: five (5) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and three (3) units with auditory/visual disabilities.; All units will be adaptable and "visitable." All units will have universal design features.

	Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by 20%.
Project Green Building Features	Platinum Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 141.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community kitchen space, community room, designated support services office, elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager’s office. The project is located .4 miles from Ramirez Market, and 1.1 miles from Whole foods. Alameda Creek Regional Park is located 0.6 miles away, and Centerville Junior High is located 0.5 miles away. The closest bus stop is located .03 miles away.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will coordinate services through Eden Housing Resident Services Inc. (EHRSI). Services provided will include workshops in Housing Stability, Economic Empowerment. Education for Children and adults, health and wellness training, community engagement, and technology access. Additionally, referrals to other service programs will be provided.
Developer Capacity/Experience	Eden is a Tier 1 developer. Since its founding in 1968, Eden has developed, acquired or rehabilitated more than 10,600 affordable units, and currently provides homes to more than 22,000 lower-income residents. Incomes of residents typically range from 20% to 60% of AMI

PROJECT NAME	Lazuli Landing
Average Score	84.67
Project Address	Mission Blvd. between D St., E St., and 2nd St.
Project Developer	MidPen Housing (MidPen)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New Construction providing housing for low income workforce/families.
Total Project Units and Sizes	81 total; 80 affordable; 1 resident manager's unit 18 one-bedroom units 35 two-bedroom units (including resident manager's unit) 28 three-bedroom units
General Income Levels Served	100% affordable to households earning at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
16 units (20% of total units)	16 units (20% of total units)	80 units for lower income workforce and families	16 units (20% of total units)	Has not committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	80 units (99% of total units) 16 at 20% AMI 16 at 40% AMI 21 at 50% AMI 21 at 60% AMI 6 at 80% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$6,000,630– Regional Pool; \$8,781,121—Base City 20% of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 14,324,924 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$526,136 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees). The City of Livermore has provided a commitment of \$6.8 million in city funding to the project, and \$7.49 million in a land donation.
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA review for this project is in process. The estimated date of completion is 01/28/2020. NEPA review has not been completed.
Project Accessibility	Thirteen (13) units are accessible: nine (9) units will be for

	residents with physical disabilities and four (4) units for residents with auditory/visual disabilities. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by over 20%.
Project Green Building Features	LEED scorecard indicates anticipated point score of 61.5 points.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: broad-band infrastructure, centralized laundry, community kitchen space, community room, computer lab, designated support services office, elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, play lot, property manager’s office, and resident services and/or case management offices. Project is located 0.3 miles from Guy Junior Emanuele Elementary School and 0.5 miles from Mission Hills Middle School. The nearest grocery stores are Mexico Super and Supermercado Guadalajara, which are located 0.5 and 0.6 miles away, respectively. Decoto Park is located 0.2 miles from the project. There is an AC transit bus stop located 0.07 miles from the project, and the Union City Bart station is located 1 mile away.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will provide services through MidPen Resident Services Corporation. Services will adult education on available outside services, independent living skills, parent education, computer learning, exercise and nutrition and financial literacy management. MidPen Services staff will also provide similar on-site programing for youth and working age adults.
Developer Capacity/Experience	MidPen is a Tier 1 developer. In its 50 years history, MidPen has developed or rehabilitated over 8,000 affordable homes across 11 counties. MidPen has completed more than 3 similar projects all of which were completed on time and within budget.

PROJECT NAME	Newark Timber Street Senior
Average Score	73.17
Project Address	37660 Timber Street
Project Developer	Eden Housing, Inc. (Eden)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	79 total; 78 affordable; 1 resident manager’s unit 78 studios 1 two-bedroom units (including resident manager’s unit)
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households earning at or below 50% Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County’s Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
16 units (20% of total units)	16 units (20% of total units)	78 units for seniors	16 units (20% of total units)	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	78 total units (99% of total units) 16 at 20% AMI 62 at 50% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$6,754,002– Regional Pool, \$2,713,174—Base City; 20% of Total Development Cost
Proposed Match Amount and Detail	\$ 2,765,000 The proposed match exceeds the required minimum of \$112,180 (value of planning and building fees less impact fees).
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	CEQA and NEPA review have not been completed. Preliminary environmental and geotechnical reviews have been undertaken.
Project Accessibility	Eight (8) units are accessible: five (5) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and three (3) units with auditory/visual disabilities. All units will be adaptable and “visitable”. All units will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by 20%.
Project Green Building Features	Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 110.

Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community kitchen space, community room, computer lab, elevator, outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager's office, resident services and/or case management offices. The project is located 0.5 miles from Herat Market and 0.9 miles from Grocery Outlet, both moderately sized grocery stores. The closest park is Birch Grove Park, which is .4 miles away. A bus stop is located 0.06 miles away at Cedar Boulevard and Central Avenue.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will coordinate services through Eden Housing Resident Services Inc. (EHRSI). Services provided will include English as a second language courses, financial education, job skills training, health and wellness classes, green education youth programming, and art classes. Additionally, referrals to other service programs will be provided.
Developer Capacity/Experience	Eden is a Tier 1 developer. Since its founding in 1968 Eden has developed, acquired or rehabilitated more than 10,600 affordable units, and currently provides homes to more than 22,000 lower-income residents. Incomes of residents typically range from 20% to 60% AMI

Attachment 3 – Unincorporated County Base City Allocation Request for Proposals Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The total amount of the Unincorporated County ‘Base City’ Allocation project funds, \$17,704,703, was released in the Request for Proposals (RFP). Two projects applied for funding with requests totaling \$26,606,927. One project is in Ashland and one is in Castro Valley.

Table 1: Project Proposals

Project Name	Developer	Unincorporated Area	Funding Request
Madrone Terrace	Resources for Community Development	Ashland	\$14,779,540
Ruby Street Apartments	Eden Housing, Inc.	Castro Valley	\$11,827,387

Madrone Terrace is a 79-unit new construction project located in the Unincorporated Area of Ashland. The project will include sixteen (16) units for households with incomes at or below 20% AMI and thirty-two (32) units for households with incomes at or below 30% AMI, all of which will be targeted for the chronically homeless. Project amenities include a childcare center, a community kitchen space, and outdoor landscaped seating areas. The project is located 0.3 miles from an elementary school as well as Edendale Park.

Ruby Street Apartments is a 72-unit new construction project located in Castro Valley. The project will include fifteen (15) units for households earning at or below 20% AMI, all of which will be targeted to homeless households. Project amenities include a walking path along the creek, a community room, outdoor landscaped seating areas, and a play lot. The project is located 0.4 miles from a community park.

Both projects met minimum thresholds and were scored by the Unincorporated County Base City Allocation County Selection Committee (CSC). Both projects met the minimum of 70 points required to be considered for funding recommendation.

RFP Goals, Threshold Requirements, and Evaluation Criteria

The RFP thresholds and evaluation criteria were developed primarily to incentivize the project readiness, financial feasibility, leveraging of the A1 investment, and targeting of the Measure A1-funded units to homeless populations through the provision of permanent supportive housing units to the greatest extent possible.

Minimum Thresholds - Projects were assessed first on whether they attained minimum threshold requirements. After staff determined that a project met minimum threshold, it was approved for evaluation based on the rating and ranking Evaluation Criteria. The RFP contained nine threshold requirements; seven from the adopted Implementation Policies for the Measure A1 Rental Housing Development Fund, and two additional thresholds specific to this RFP.

The thresholds from the Implementation Policies included, among others, the requirement that at least twenty percent (20%) of the total project units would be reserved for households with incomes at or below twenty percent (20%) of the Area Median Income (AMI) and that the project serve at least one of the adopted Measure A1 target populations including homeless people, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, re-entry populations, transition-age youth, and lower income workforce. Additional threshold requirements added to this RFP addressed the goals of project feasibility and readiness to proceed. The threshold requirements were designed to ensure that those projects recommended Measure A1 funding will reasonably be able to move into construction within twelve months.

Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria - **Attachment 3A** contains the RFP minimum thresholds and rating and ranking Evaluation Criteria used in the 2019 Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP. A maximum of 119 points were available. Several criteria assessed the project's financial feasibility, readiness to proceed, likelihood of success with outside competitive funding sources, alignment with Measure A1 Implementation Policies, developer experience and capacity, and conformance with HCD's Housing Development Program Policies and Procedures and Administrative Loan Terms. These technical criteria included:

- Readiness to Proceed: 15 points
- Match, Leveraging, and Measure A1 Investment: 10 points
- Financial Feasibility: 21 points
- Developer/Sponsor Experience: 16 points
- **Total Technical Points: 62**

Other categories addressed target populations and project characteristics. These criteria included:

- Neighborhood Access and Amenities: 5 points
- Project Amenities, Accessibility and Green Building: 15 points
- Targeting Units to Homeless or ELI Populations: 18 points
- Resident Services/Supportive Services: 6 points
- Development Partnership: 5 points
- Bonus Points for Additional 20% AMI Units Targeted for Homeless: 8 points
- **Total Points for this Section: 57**

The Unincorporated County Base City Allocation RFP was the same as the Regional Pool RFPs with a few exceptions. First, the Unincorporated County minimum threshold requirements did not allow the developer to be a local government agency, as the Regional Pool minimum thresholds do, since the projects will be in the unincorporated County and the County will not be the developer. Second, the Unincorporated County minimum match requirement allows the project to demonstrate that the minimum-required match from the County will be committed in advance of construction loan closing, not at the time of the application. With regard to the Rating and Ranking Criteria, the Unincorporated County RFP is the same as the Regional Pool RFP except the Unincorporated County RFP does not have points for "additional match provided beyond minimum requirements", as there is no city to provide matching funds.

In addition, the Unincorporated County RFP contained the following language: *HCD reserves the right to recommend funding for less than the amount requested by an applicant, and/or apportion funds between projects in cases of tie scores, as needed to expend funds in a timely fashion, and/or to achieve Measure A1 goals.* The Measure A1 Implementation Policies include goals of producing the largest number of units possible and maximizing leverage of other funding sources, both of which are achieved with the even split of funding in the Unincorporated County RFP.

Project Scores and Funding Recommendations

After review and scoring by the members of the CSC, the average of the three CSC total scores was then used to rank the projects. In this case, the two project scores were almost equal: 83.67 for Madrone Terrace and 83 for Ruby Street Apartments.

HCD recommends dividing the available funding equally between the two proposed projects. As noted above, the RFP contained language allowing HCD to recommend less than the total amount requested by an applicant to achieve Measure A1 goals. Funding both projects will support the Measure A1 goal of maximizing the number of affordable units produced with Measure A1 funds allocation, in accordance with the RFP language above. In addition, it allows the funds to provide the maximum affordable housing benefit to the Unincorporated County from its Base City Allocation. Ideally, this recommendation will also allow the Unincorporated County to benefit from the maximum amount of State and Federal affordable housing financing being leveraged to support these two developments. This is especially important give the lack of any alternate significant amount of local funding for affordable housing development in the Unincorporated County.

Table 2: Unincorporated County Project Rankings and Funding Recommendations

Project Name	Project Ranking	Average Score	Funding Request	Funding Recommendation
Madrone Terrace	1	83.67	\$14,779,540	\$8,852,351.50
Ruby Street Apartments	2	83.00	\$11,827,387	\$8,852,351.50

If both recommended projects are funded, as shown below in Table 3, these two projects would add 149 new affordable units to Alameda County’s affordable housing stock, of which 31 will be set aside for households with incomes at or below 20% of the Area Median Income (AMI), all of which will be set aside for permanent supportive housing for the homeless. A project summary for each project is attached.

Table 3: Units in Unincorporated County Projects Recommended for Funding

Project Name	Total Units	Affordable Units	Units at or below 20% AMI	Homeless Units
Madrone Terrace	79	78	16	16
Ruby Street Apartments	72	71	15	15

**Attachment 3A— Measure A1 Unincorporated County Base City Allocation
 RFP Minimum Thresholds and Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria**

Measure A1 Rental Fund Unincorporated County Base City Allocation Rating and Ranking Evaluation Criteria (September 2019)	Maximum	Scoring Notes
A. Readiness to Proceed	15	
1. Amount of Financing Commitments	5	Points awarded based on a percentage of total committed permanent financing sources, with exception of Measure A1 funding request . All funding sources with exception of A1 must be committed to receive maximum points. Points awarded on a sliding scale for - evidence of enforceable financing commitments other than Measure A1: 5 points if all but A1 are committed; 4 points if 90-99% committed; 3 points if 80-89%; 2 points if 70-79%; 5 points if 60-69%; 1 point if 50-59%; 0 points if less than 50% committed excluding Measure A1.
2. Environmental Review Approvals	2	Sliding scale based on project's progress towards obtaining Environmental Review Approvals. 2 points if awarded, 1 if under review, and 0 if not yet sought.
3. Entitlements	2	Sliding scale based on project's progress towards obtaining Land Use or Planning Entitlements. 2 points if awarded, 1 if under review, and 0 if not yet sought.
4. Project Ownership Entity	2	2 points if project ownership entity (LLC or LP) has been formed and documentation has been submitted with Application; otherwise, 0 points. For the purposes of this criteria, a W-9, LP Agreement or Articles of Incorporation will be considered acceptable evidence of ownership entity formation.
5. Evaluation of Scope of Development and Project Plan	2	Sliding scale: 2 points for well-defined project that responds comprehensively to required components of the Project Narrative submitted with Application, and scope of development is feasible and meets Measure A1 goals and policies. Otherwise points deducted.
6. Community Outreach Plan is Completed or Underway	2	2 points if Application includes documentation that Community Outreach Plan has been completed or is underway and evidence of such engagement (presentations, flyers, sign-in-sheets, comments received, actions taken) is included with application; 1 points if Community Outreach Plan has been developed but has not begun; 0 points if no plan submitted and no actions taken.
B. Neighborhood Access and Amenities	5	
7. Proximity to services that meet needs of target population(s) of the project (e.g. for family development, proximity to public schools; for senior development, proximity to senior services; for special needs, proximity to services for target population)	2	2 points if project is within 1/2 mile, 1 point if within 1 mile, 0 points if more than 1 mile away. TCAC Regulations have points for types of services needed for type of population. For a general family development, proximity to public schools shall be evaluated. For a Senior Development, proximity to a daily operated senior center or services site for seniors shall be evaluated. For a Special Needs development, proximity to services serving the target population shall be evaluated.
8. Proximity to full-scale grocery store, neighborhood market, and/or farmers' market	1	1 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a full-scale grocery store, 1/2 point if within 1 mile, 0 points if more than 1 mile away. Full-scale grocery stores have at least 25,000 gross interior square feet where staples, fresh meat, and fresh produce are sold. 1/2 point if project is within 1/4 mile of neighborhood market of 5,000 sf where staples, fresh meat, and fresh produce are sold. 1/2 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a weekly farmers' market on list of Certified Farmers' Markets maintained by CA Department of Food & Agriculture and operated at least 5 months per year.
9. Proximity to public transit station	1	1 point if project is within 1/3 mile of public bus stop, light rail station, commuter rail station, ferry terminal, bus station and/or BART station with service at least every 30 minutes during the hours of 7-9am and 4-6pm Monday-Friday. 1/2 point if within 1/2 mile of these public transit facilities, 0 points if more than 1/2 mile away.
10. Proximity to public park, recreation or community center open to the public	1	1 point if project is within 1/2 mile of a public park, recreation center or community center open to the public, 1/2 point if within 3/4 miles, 0 points if more than 3/4 mile away

C. Project Amenities, Accessibility and Green Building	15	
11. Availability of Onsite Amenities	4	0.5 point for every onsite amenity, up to the max of 4 points (Broad-Band Infrastructure Installed throughout, Project, Centralized Laundry, Child Care Center, Community Garden/Planting Beds, Community Kitchen Space, Community Room, Computer Lab, Designated, Support Services Office, Elevator, Outdoor Landscaped Seating Areas, Play Lot/Tot Lot, Property Manager's Office, Resident Services and/or Case Management Offices, or others)
12. Project exceeds minimum accessibility requirements	6	(Sliding Scale: Universal Design = full points; minimum accessibility = 0 points since it is threshold). 2 points if exceeds the minimum number of required accessible units per Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by at least 20%; 3 points if exceeds minimum accessible units by at least 20% <u>plus</u> all remaining units are adaptable; 4 points if exceeds min. accessible units by at least 20%, and all remaining units adaptable <u>plus</u> 100% of project units being Visitable; 6 points if project exceeds Section 504 accessibility by 20%, remaining adaptable units, and project uses Universal Design principles.
13. Project Level of Energy Efficiency/Green Building	5	For Rehab Projects: GPR of 80+ points receives 5 points; GPR score 65-79 gets 3 points; less than GPR score of 65 gets no points. For New construction projects: GPR 140+ (Platinum) or LEED Platinum receives 5 points; GPR 110-139 (Gold) gets 4 points; GPR 80-109 (Silver) or LEED Silver gets 2 points, less than these standards gets no points. Hybrid Rehab/New Construction Projects will receive a weighted score dependent on the number of units associated with each type of development.
D. Targeting Units to Homeless or ELI Populations	18	
14. 20% AMI Units will serve Homeless Populations	6	Project units that are designated for households at 20% or less of AMI (20% of total units must be at 20% AMI per minimum required threshold) will ALL serve homeless populations. Units must be designated for homeless populations, be rented at 20% AMI rent levels, and have a commitment of operating subsidy. 6 points if yes to all conditions; 3 points if units are designated for homeless populations and will be rented at 20% AMI rent levels, but do not yet have a commitment of operating subsidy; otherwise 0 points.
15. Referrals from County Coordinated Entry System to Reach the Homeless with the Highest Barriers to Housing	5	Project will accept referrals for the units designated for homeless populations through the County's Coordinated Entry System, and application includes written commitment of such intention from the executive director of the developer organization. 5 points if yes; otherwise 0 points.
16. Commitment to WIC Section 8255(b) "Housing First" Tenant Screening and Selection Practices	3	Project agrees to implement "Housing First" tenant screening and selection practices as codified in Section 8255(b) of Chapter 6.5 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code. Written commitment must come from the executive director of the developer organization. 3 points if yes; otherwise 0 points. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WIC&division=8.&title=&part=&chapter=6.5.&article=
17. Project has set aside more than the minimum required 20% of total units at 20% AMI for Extremely Low-Income (ELI) Households (households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI), and these households pay no more than 30% of income for rent. Project must meet feasibility test to gain these points	4	1 point for each additional 5% of project units (beyond 20% requirement) provided at 30% or less of AMI up to the maximum 4 points (i.e. projects that provide 40% of total project units for households at or below 30% AMI get full points). Project must receive 2 points under criteria #23 to receive full points under this category.

E. Resident Services/Supportive Services			6
18. Is the Services Plan well-defined and appropriate for the targeted population?	2	Applicant has submitted with application either a written Resident Services Plan and/or a Supportive Services Plan for Special Needs Populations, as applicable. The plan(s) has an identified service provider(s) and scope of services. Scope of services is appropriate for the target populations, FTEs are indicated, plan describes services coordination and case management to be provided, and includes designated services coordinator work space and private space for counseling as required at the project site. Plan discusses whether services are on-site versus referrals to other agencies, and types of services (e.g. children/youth services, tutoring, computer training, other programs; physical and mental health services; education, financial literacy, employment, etc. 2 points, yes; 0 points if no.	
19. Is the supportive services budget fully defined, and are there funds identified to pay for it?	2	2 points, yes; 0 points for gaps. The Operating budget must include cost of supportive services. Provide description of what services are provided and the budget for the services. Note if external services are provided at the expense of the external organization.	
20. If applicable, are there commitment letters from service providers or MOUs with service providers?	2	If using external organizations and have documentation, 2 points. If providing in-house services, 2 points (no commitment letters/MOUs necessary). If using external orgs and no documentation, 0 points.	
F. Leveraging and Measure A1 Investment			10
21. Leveraging of Measure A1 Funding Based on Permanent Commitments	5	Degree to which enforceable permanent financing commitments have been received to leverage Measure A1 funds. Based on amount of enforceable permanent financing commitments from sources other than Measure A1 as percentage of requested amount of Measure A1, as follows: 0 points for less than 25%; 1 point: 25-49%; 2 points: 50-99%; 3 points 100% to 149%; 4 points 150% to 199%; 5 points: >200%.	
22. Amount of Measure A1 Investment Per Project - Based on Permanent Financing Need	5	Ratio of total proposed Measure A1 funds as a percentage of total project costs (TPC) based on permanent financing need. 0 points if Applicant is seeking maximum A1 funds per Policies. For 9% TCAC projects, 1 point if A1 is >25% but less than 30% of TPC; 2 points if A1 is >20% but less than 25%; 3 points if A1 is >15% but less than 20% of TPC; 4 points if A1 is >10% but less than 15% of TPC; 5 points is A1 is less than 10% of TPC. For 4% TCAC projects, 1 point if A1 is >30% but less than 40% of TPC; 2 points if A1 is >20% but less than 30% TPC; 3 points if A1 is >10% but less than 20% TPC; 4 points if A1 is >5% but less than 10% TPC; 5 points if A1 is less than 5% TPC. <u>For project not seeking tax credits, will use 9% TCAC scale.</u>	
G. Financial Feasibility			21
23. Feasibility of Financing Plan	2	Financing Plan submitted with Application demonstrates that project has a strong likelihood of receiving proposed funding sources. See RFP and Application for further instructions on required components of Financing Plan. Sliding scale: 2 points if Financing Plan is feasible and there is strong likelihood of project receiving proposed funding sources, and financing meets Measure A1 goals and policies. Otherwise, deduct points accordingly.	
24. Reasonable Development Costs Analysis	5	subcategories below	
25. Project hard costs are no more than 15% different from average of comparable projects (land & soft costs excluded). If a rehab, PNA justifies costs.	4	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Considers both hard cost per unit and hard cost per square foot, if within 15% in either category project will be awarded full points. notes also state that below 15% should not be penalized	
26. Required contingency standards are met (10% for new construction; 15% for rehabilitation)	0	Required	
27. Relocation budget is appropriate amount for project (if required)	1	Full points if yes (or not required), 0 points if no. Budget should be based on an independent, recently completed Relocation Plan	
28. The proforma demonstrates the project's ability to meet its obligations, make payments, and maintain project over time	8	subcategories below	
29. Cash flow budget includes \$300/unit/year monitoring fee	1	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Only refers to HCD-restricted units. The number of these units should be based on that indicated in the Proforma and referred to throughout the application.	
30. Replacement reserves meet County's standard	1	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Refer to County's Policies and Procedures for comparison.	
31. Operating reserves meet County's standard	2	Full points if yes, 0 points if no. Refer to County's Policies and Procedures for comparison.	
32. Is cash flow positive over 15 year period	4	Full points, if yes; if not, 0 points. Cash flow can be maintained by withdrawing from operating reserves	
33. Reasonable & Feasible Operating Budget, measured on a per unit/per year basis; committed sources of rental subsidy required for points if it is proposed in the proforma	6	subcategories below	
34. Operating costs(not including direct services) vary by no more than 15% from the average of similar projects in this RFP round	3	Full points if yes, 0 points if no.	
35. If operating subsidy is needed, is it committed?	3	Full points if yes, 0 points if not committed. If it doesn't need rental subsidy, then it gets full points.	

H. Developer/Sponsor Experience	16	
36. Completing more than 3 similar projects or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects on time and within budget	3	3 points if all projects listed completed construction within past 10 years; 2 points if some projects listed completed construction within past 10 years; 1 point if all projects listed completed construction more than 10 years ago.
37. Lead Staff (Project Manager) Experience	2	2 points if PM has completed at least 2 similar projects or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points, 1/2 points if they completed 1 project, 0 points if they have not completed any projects
38. Lead Staff (Project Manager) Capacity	1	Working on up to 3 projects (including one in the application) or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points, more than 3 projects, 0 points.
39. Strength of Development Team (Architect, GC, Legal, Financial Consultant)	3	Other team members (architect, general contractor, legal, financial consultant) have worked on at least 3 similar projects(including one in the application) or a combination of equivalent, dissimilar projects is full points. If other team members have worked on 2 similar projects, deduct 0.5 point; 1 similar project, deduct 1 point
40. Management Company Experience	1	1 point if management company has 11 or more projects managed over 3 years; 1/2 point if 6-10 projects managed over 3 years
41. Experience meeting Local/Targeted Hiring Goals	1	The applicant submits evidence of meeting local/targeted hiring goals in at least 3 previous affordable housing developments completed in the past 10 years. 1 point if yes, 0 points if no.
42. Developer has local government reference letter for past performance, including monitoring performance.	5	The applicant submits written letter of reference/recommendation from housing director or equivalent level from jurisdiction other than jurisdiction in which proposed Measure A1 project located. 5 points if letter provides positive recommendation on developer's ability to deliver affordable housing project on-time and on-budget and have no unresolved findings and/or issues with respect to monitoring performance. Deduct points accordingly.
I. Development Partnership	5	
43. Developer has partnered with a Community-Based or Faith-Based Organization with land asset for project	5	The developer is partnering with a community-based or faith-based organization (CBO or FBO) bringing land asset to the proposed development. 5 points if yes; 0 points if no. Application must include written documentation of partnership through MOU or other equivalent executed agreement between developer and CBO/FBO.
J. Total Points	111	
44. BONUS POINTS FOR ADDITIONAL 20% AMI UNITS TARGETED FOR HOMELESS	8	Basic threshold requires projects to include 20% of total units for households at 20% AMI or less. If project will designate additional units for households over and above the 20% of total required <u>which are specifically designated for homeless households, have committed operating subsidies, and have agreed to accept referrals through the County's Coordinated Entry System</u> , bonus points will be awarded. Up to 4 points will be available for projects that set aside up to 40% of their units for homeless (1pt for each 5% of units); AND 4 points will be available on a bell curve for the total number of units set aside (project with most gets all four, project with least gets 1).
K. Total Points Including Bonus Points	119	

Minimum Threshold Requirements

- 1) The developer must be a nonprofit organization or a joint venture.
- 2) The proposed project must be located in an unincorporated area of Alameda County.
- 3) The majority of project units must serve households with incomes between 30% and 60% AMI for Alameda County, as published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
- 4) At least twenty percent (20%) of the project units must be reserved for extremely low-income households with incomes of no more than 20% AMI.
- 5) The project must be new construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, rehabilitation of existing affordable housing with extended affordability.
- 6) Project must provide permanent affordable rental housing.
- 7) Applicants must have site control, and evidence of site control must be included in the application.
- 8) Project will serve at least one of the priority target population groups identified in the Implementation Policies, including the following: homeless people, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, re-entry populations, transition-age youth aging out of foster care, and/or lower-income workforce.
- 9) Requested funds must fill a financing gap. The project must not already be fully funded with permanent financing, and Measure A1 may not replace other permanent funding on the project.

Attachment 3B – Project Summaries

PROJECT NAME	Madrone Terrace
Average Score	83.67
Project Address	16060 E 14 th Street, San Leandro, CA 94578
Project Developer	Resources for Community Development (RCD)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	79 total; 78 affordable; 1 resident manager’s unit 36 one-bedroom units 21 two-bedroom units (including the resident manager’s unit) 22 three-bedroom units
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households at or below 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County’s Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
16 units (20% of total units)	32 units (40% of total units)	58 units for lower income families and 20 units for chronically homeless	All 16 20% AMI units and 4 30% AMI units are targeted for the chronically homeless (26% of total units)	Has not committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	78 units (99% of total units) 16 at 20% AMI 16 at 30% AMI 38 at 50% AMI 8 at 60% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$14,779,540– Regional Pool 20% of Total Development Cost
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	Developer maintains that under streamlined SB 35 approval processes, consistent with County standards, the project is not subject to CEQA. A draft NEPA document is currently under review by the County.
Project Accessibility	Eight (8) units are accessible: six (6) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and two (2) units for residents with auditory/visual disabilities. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by over 20%.
Project Green Building Features	GreenPoint Certified Platinum, with a score of 144.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, childcare center, community kitchen space, community room, elevator,

	<p>outdoor landscaped seating areas, property manager’s office, resident services and/or case management offices. The project is located 0.2 miles from Edendale Middle School and 0.3 miles from Hillside Elementary School. The nearest grocery store is the San Leandro Farmers’ Market located 0.5 miles away. Edendale Park is located 0.3 miles from the project. An AC transit bus stop is located 0.03 miles from the project, and the Bay Fair Bart Station is located 0.4 miles away.</p>
<p>Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision</p>	<p>RCD will provide on-site resident service coordinators. services will consist of housing retention, health and wellness, economic stability & jobs education, youth enrichment and social resident engagement classes and opportunities.</p>
<p>Developer Capacity/Experience</p>	<p>RCD is a Tier 1 developer. Over the past 35 years, RCD has developed more than 2,200 units of housing for families, seniors, HOPWA, special needs and formerly homeless residents and has over 300 units in predevelopment.</p>

PROJECT NAME	Ruby Street Apartments
Average Score	83.00
Project Address	1744 Ruby Street
Project Developer	Eden Housing, Inc. (Eden)
Joint Venture or Partnering with Community- or Faith-Based Organization	No
Type of Project	New construction
Total Project Units and Sizes	72 total; 71 affordable; 1 resident manager's unit, 8 studio 27 one-bedroom units 18 two-bedroom units (including resident manager's unit) 19 three-bedroom units
General Income Levels Served	100 % affordable to households at or below 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Measure A1 Target Populations, Targeting to Extremely Low-Income Households, and Use of County's Coordinated Entry System (Home Stretch) and Housing First

% Units at or below 20% AMI	% Units at or below 30% AMI	A1 Target Populations	Targeting of 20% AMI Units to Homeless	CES & Housing First	Proposed HCD Units
15 units (21% of total units)	15 units (21% of total units)	71 units for families	15 units	Has committed to use CES & Housing First for homeless units	50 units (68% of total units) 15 at 20% AMI 25 at 50% AMI 10 at 60% AMI

Measure A1 Request/Type As % of Total Development Cost	\$11,827,387– Regional Pool 23% of Total Development Cost
Project Planning Approvals and Environmental Review Clearances	The County CEQA Consultant has determined that the project is eligible for a Community Plan Exemption from CEQA. NEPA review has not been completed.
Project Accessibility	Eight (8) units are accessible: five (5) units will be for residents with physical disabilities and three (3) units for residents with auditory/visual disabilities. All units will be adaptable and “visitable”. All units will have universal design features. Accessible units will exceed Section 504 requirements by 20%.
Project Green Building Features	Gold Level with a GreenPoint Rated score of 111.
Project Amenities and Neighborhood Access	Amenities at project site: centralized laundry, community room, designated support services office, elevator, outdoor

	landscaped seating areas, play lot, property manager's office, Resident servicers and/or case management offices. The project is located 0.3 miles from Dehoff's Key Market and 0.7 miles from Lucky. The closest park is Red Morton Community Park which is located 0.4 miles away. There is a bus stop at Roosevelt Avenue and Ruby Street, 0.2 miles away.
Resident Services & Supportive Services Provision	Developer will coordinate services through Eden Housing Resident Services Inc. (EHRSI). Services provided will include workshops in housing stability, economic empowerment, education for children and adults, health and wellness training, community engagement, and technology access. Additionally, referrals to other service programs will be provided.
Developer Capacity/Experience	Eden is a Tier 1 developer. Since its founding in 1968 Eden has developed, acquired or rehabilitated more than 10,600 affordable units, and currently provides homes to more than 22,000 lower-income residents. Incomes of residents typically range from 20% to 60% of AMI